

of Staff; without amendment (Rept. No. 1666). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 532. Resolution to direct the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct an investigation of the Wage Stabilization Board; with amendment (Rept. No. 1667). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 520. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of offensive and undesirable books and radio and television programs; without amendment (Rept. No. 1668). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 591. Resolution for consideration of S. 1203, an act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1669). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 545. Resolution to amend the rules of the House of Representatives, so as to provide that no general appropriation bill shall be considered in the House until committee hearings and reports on such bill have been available for at least 7 calendar days; with amendment (Rept. No. 1670). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 5998. A bill to amend the excise tax on photographic apparatus; without amendment (Rept. No. 1671). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 7289. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BAKEWELL:

H. R. 7290. A bill to create a National Cemetery Commission for the consolidation of national cemetery activities within one civilian commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 7291. A bill to provide that lands reserved to the Territory of Alaska for educational purposes may be leased for periods not in excess of 25 years; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 7292. A bill to provide for the payment of lump-sum death benefits to the survivors of certain employees of those contracting with the United States during World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7293. A bill to extend detention benefits under the War Claims Act of 1948 to employees of contractors with the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McMULLEN:

H. R. 7294. A bill to amend the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, so as to include certain floricultural products in the commodities to which the act applies; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 7295. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act, with respect to the form, venue, and jurisdiction of proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 7296. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, with respect to credit for past service;

to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 7297. A bill to prevent Federal dam and reservoir projects from interfering with sustained-yield timber operations; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 7298. A bill to authorize the consolidation of the area of Vicksburg National Military Park, in the State of Mississippi, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relating to their assembly resolution No. 74, relative to requesting approval of H. R. 5219, a bill to provide for the development of a deep waterway on Lake Champlain; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKEWELL:

H. R. 7299. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lum Shee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 7300. A bill for the relief of Hans R. Zimmer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWARD:

H. R. 7301. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Viola Delaney; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 7302. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to certain allottees on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 7303. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to certain allottees on the Crow Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 7304. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to William Jennings; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 7305. A bill to authorize the sale of certain land in Utah to the Bench Lake Irrigation Co., of Hurricane, Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 7306. A bill for the relief of Alfred J. Stahl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 7307. A bill for the relief of Sotirios Tselepis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 7308. A bill for the relief of Michael Clive Ossorio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 7309. A bill for the relief of Armand Edward Blackmar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7310. A bill for the relief of Eno Picou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 7311. A bill for the relief of Francisca de Guia and Beatriz B. Palmares; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 7312. A bill for the relief of Kim Young Soo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. Con. Res. 206. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

658. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of the Milwaukee Cooperative Milk Producers. Over 1,000 people were present at the annual meeting on March 11, 1952, to go on record opposing universal military service as being un-American and against the best interests of our country and ask our Wisconsin Congressmen and Senators to vigorously oppose legislation that would make universal military service the law of the land; to the Committee on Armed Services.

659. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, Detroit, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a resolution adopted at the national congress of petroleum retailers session held in Chicago, Ill., August 21 through 25, 1951, urging amendments to our Federal antitrust laws for the purpose of strengthening them and implementing their enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 31, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1952)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, Thou hast made all the highways of our hearts to lead to Thy face; Thou hast so formed our being that its deeper cravings are satisfied only in Thee. Help us this noontide to turn our faces in Thy shining, O Thou sun of our help and strength.

We confess that in the conceit of our own self-sufficiency too often we have turned, with our burning thirsts, to the broken cisterns of worldly wisdom and of our own sophisticated cleverness. May those who here serve the public weal be wise interpreters of Thy eternal law, the brave spokesmen of Thy will and of Thy truth which sets men free. And, above all, teach us the vanity and futility of any quest for salvation which leaves ourselves unchanged. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 28, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the

President had approved and signed the following acts:

On March 28, 1952:

- S. 183. An act for the relief of Elfriede Ehrhardt Otto;
- S. 465. An act for the relief of Oswald A. Drica-Minieris;
- S. 560. An act for the relief of Dr. Louis S. K. Yuan;
- S. 589. An act for the relief of Sister Edeltrudis Saller;
- S. 606. An act for the relief of Fede Vita Guzzardi;
- S. 828. An act for the relief of Berta Gomes Leite;
- S. 914. An act for the relief of Masako Miyazaki;
- S. 1255. An act for the relief of Leopold Kahn, Jr.;
- S. 1541. An act for the relief of Dr. Francis S. N. Kwok;
- S. 1620. An act for the relief of Tory Lee Eakin;
- S. 1782. An act for the relief of Mrs. Despina Hodos;
- S. 1925. An act for the relief of Gregory Joseph Coles; and
- S. 2697. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

On March 31, 1952:

- S. 1938. An act granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 69) authorizing the appointment of a joint committee to arrange for the inauguration of the President-elect of the United States on January 20, 1953.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2408) to amend the act authorizing the negotiation and ratification of certain contracts with certain Indians of the Sioux Tribe in order to extend the time for negotiation and approval of such contracts, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7216) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CLEMENTS was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today because of official business.

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HENNINGS and Mr. KILGORE were excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow because of official business.

On request of Mr. BRIDGES, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KEM was ex-

cused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate Monday through Friday of this week.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to transact routine business without debate, and without the time being counted against either side under the unanimous-consent agreement. But prior to that, I suggest that the junior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] be recognized, and that any other Senator who desires to speak upon the subject she will discuss may do so without the time being counted under the unanimous-consent agreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In other words, the Senator suggests that the charging of time under the unanimous-consent agreement begin after the transaction of routine business, and any addresses upon the subject which will be discussed by the Senator from Maine.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, before the Senator from Maine starts her remarks, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR WALLACE H. WHITE, OF MAINE

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, the most gentle and best beloved man to serve in the United States Senate in the memory of most of us here has just passed on to perpetual peace and rest. Wallace H. White, Jr., in the quiet of sleep, passed on to his Maker early this morning.

I know the sorrow that his death brings to the United States Senate, in which he served so well and long. The kindness and the patience he displayed as both majority leader and minority leader in the Senate will long be remembered and deeply appreciated.

It has been with humility in the recognition of his true greatness that I have followed him into the Senate. He was my predecessor, and I know that I can never fill the great role he played in this legislative body.

Wallace H. White, Jr., not only by temperament, but also by training, experience, and ability, was the personification of the very best that is in Congress. Thirty-nine years after his birth

in Lewiston, Maine, on August 6, 1877, Wallace White came to the House of Representatives.

There he served with distinction for seven terms until 1931, when he moved up to the United States Senate. His long public service was climaxed in 1947 when he became the majority leader of the Senate in the Eightieth Congress. With the quiet grace that was so characteristic of him, Wallace White retired from public life at the end of the Eightieth Congress.

His illustrious service in the Halls of Congress was no accident. He trained well and hard for it. After graduating from Bowdoin College in 1899, he came to Washington to study law. To finance his way through law school, he worked as assistant clerk to the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, a committee which he was to head years later as its chairman.

He once served as secretary to the President of the Senate, and also as private secretary for his grandfather, Senator William P. Frye, once President pro tempore of the Senate.

Wallace H. White, Jr., could truly be characterized by service, training, and background as Mr. Senate.

I have spoken of the grief the death of Wallace H. White, Jr., brings to the Senate, to the people of Maine, of whom he was so proud, and who were so proud of him as their Maine Senator, and to the people of the Nation.

I speak now of the grief his death brings me. I knew Wallace White for many, many years. My first venture into politics was when I campaigned for him when he first ran for, and was elected to, the United States Senate. He gave me courage, wisdom, and fatherly advice when I was in the House of Representatives. He was my illustrious predecessor, whose place in the hearts of the Members of the Senate and in the hearts of the people of Maine I can never even begin to approach.

My colleague, the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who is unavoidably absent, joins me in paying respect to the memory of Wallace H. White, Jr., and in expressing personal grief. I should like to read a statement prepared by my colleague:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BREWSTER

Over 30 years Wallace White served the State of Maine. His first love always continued for the woods, the lakes, and seacoast of Maine.

The Rangeley region and Boothbay Harbor were as much his home as Lewiston and Auburn.

His Maine accent and down-east common sense never deserted him in all the years he served Maine so faithfully in Washington.

His voice was always heard with profound respect on the rare occasions when he chose to speak. All his colleagues knew he spoke from deep conviction and from a comprehensive knowledge born of long study in his chosen fields.

As a long-term member and ultimately chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the Senate and also as a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House, Senator White left a deep impress on the transportation and communication life of America.

The American merchant marine and all it represents to the commerce and industry of Maine and America owes a great debt to the always indefatigable labors of this always humble man from Maine.

The amazing development of radio in the last quarter of a century in America is due in no small measure to the wise provisions of legislation formulated and sponsored by Senator White.

His preeminence in both these fields was universally and uniquely recognized by his selection to head American delegations at international conferences even when he was in the minority—an almost unprecedented tribute not only to his knowledge, but also to his utter objectivity where the interests of his country were concerned.

On the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, Wallace White was one of the four Republican Members of the Senate chosen to represent the minority on the special committee of eight Senators to formulate the American viewpoint on the United Nations. This was one of the last great labors of his life and showed the continuing confidence of his colleagues in his rare wisdom and insight and understanding of international affairs.

A great public servant has passed. The words and works of Senator White remain as a beacon light and an inspiration for those who carry on his great heritage.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD be kept open for further expressions by the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and for further expressions of respect for Wallace H. White, Jr.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. BREWSTER] I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 298) was read, and, there being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider it, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. Wallace H. White, Jr., formerly a Senator from the State of Maine.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the family of the deceased, together with a transcript of remarks made in the Senate in connection therewith.

Resolved, That at the conclusion of its business today, the Senate, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, take a recess.

Mr. BRIDGES. Before the resolution is agreed to, I should like to say a few words about former Senator White.

Mr. President, early today death came to Wallace Humphrey White, Jr., a former Member of this distinguished body. He voluntarily retired from office in 1949 to a life of peace in his last few years, a peace he so richly deserved after almost a lifetime of public service.

In his youth he was a clerk to one of the committees of the United States Senate, and later served as secretary to the President pro tempore of this body. Wallace White was elected as a Representative from Maine to seven sessions of Congress from 1917 to 1931. He then was elected as a Senator from Maine, taking his oath of office in 1931, just 50 years after his distinguished grand-

father, William Pierce Frye, had become a Senator.

Senator White continued through 18 eventful years of the Nation's history to serve Maine and the United States, retiring after he had served as minority leader in the Seventy-ninth Congress and as majority leader in the Eightieth Congress.

To list his career in the Houses of Congress could not tell the full story of our former colleague. A friendly man, Senator White was the first contact with the new careers which many of the Members of this body can recall. It is my personal recollection that he, as my neighbor from Maine and as a colleague in the Senate, went out of his way to make easy for me many of the obstacles which faced each of us as we came to Washington for the first time as a United States Senator.

He was a recognized world authority in the field of radio communications and had been named by President Coolidge and President Roosevelt and several Secretaries of State to represent this country at international conference on electrical communications. His fights for legislative action concerning this field will long be remembered by many of us.

But this specialty was not his only concern. Senator White was one of those rare men who fought for the truth and right in order to find that which was the best for the Nation he loved and the people of Maine he represented.

When he retired as a public servant, the United States Senate, in which he had achieved a position of stature, the Nation and his constituents suffered a real loss, one which is now made final by his death.

Mr. President, I join with the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and her colleague the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] in support of the resolution which is presently before the Senate.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I, too, am stunned by the news of the passing of Wallace White. I am proud to be one of those who knew him intimately. There never was a more kindly gentleman to serve in the United States Senate than Wallace White. He was always willing to confer with his colleagues and to give advice to the younger Members of the Senate no matter on which side of the aisle they sat.

As has been said, he was an expert on the subject of communications. He co-authored with me legislation which provided for the merger of the domestic communication companies. It was a pleasure to work with Wallace White. His advice and counsel were always valuable.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his wife and his family.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I, too, join with the Senators who have spoken on this occasion in honor of the memory of a grand American and a wonderful citizen, a gentleman and a Christian.

When I came to the Senate I soon grew to be very fond of Wallace White. I got to know him very well. All the things which have been said of him could be multiplied many times. He was a con-

siderate gentleman, a kindly gentleman, a soft-spoken gentleman. There was about him nothing that was nasty or foul or low. His life was clean, constructive, and friendly. As I said, he was a Christian gentleman. I discussed with him at times the principles that underlie our religion.

Wallace White has gone on the journey that all of us must take some day, and I am satisfied that he will carry on as gallantly in the next plane as he carried on here. With a smile he fearlessly approached all problems, and without any hate in his being he went forward to do his appointed tasks. That was Wallace White.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I had not heard of the sudden death of former Senator Wallace White before I came on the floor a few moments ago. I would not be true to one of the finest friendships I have ever enjoyed if I did not in effect lay the poor flowers of my tribute and affection alongside those which have already been placed here in his memory.

Wallace White was one of the finest and sweetest characters I have ever known. He was soft-spoken, but his patriotism and devotion to principles were of temper steel. He would have been utterly incapable of compromising any conviction he held or any principle to which he was devoted. He was truly a Senator of the old school, one of those stalwarts who hewed to the line as he saw the line, let the consequences be what they may.

Wallace White was as gentle as a woman, but where principle was involved he was as brave as a lion.

I shall ever cherish as one of the priceless memories of my service here my personal friendship with him. I hold also as a proud possession my acquaintance with him and the inspiration that his courage and his forthrightness have been to me.

I wish to repeat a few lines from the Bard of Avon that I had the privilege of saying on this floor when Wallace White was here in life:

His life was gentle, and the elements
So mix'd in him, that Nature might stand up
And say to all the world, "This was a man!"

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I wish to join in the fitting tributes which have been paid to the late Senator from Maine, Wallace White.

Whatever might be said of him could not exaggerate the splendid qualities he possessed. His influence on the members of the Committee on Interstate Commerce cannot be adequately described. He ruled with a gentle hand, and yet he ruled well.

On January 29, when we learned that he was confined to his bed, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce wrote a letter to the Honorable Wallace H. White, Jr. This is what we said:

DEAR WALLACE: During the first meeting of the Commerce Committee earlier this week, after we had finished our chores for the day, we reminisced about our yesterdays. Naturally, we talked about Wallace White, who is such a great favorite of every member of the Commerce Committee. With great respect, love, and humility, we chatted about the

Senator who had served on the committee longest and whose service simultaneously as chairman of our committee and majority leader of the Senate was history repeating itself in a most unusual way, since his illustrious grandfather had also served in the two capacities simultaneously.

With warm affection we recalled the quiet modesty, unfailing courtesy, inexhaustive patience, and genuine regard for the problems of his colleagues, regardless of party; his wide knowledge, long experience, and the thorough competence of our beloved former chairman, who guided us with such a firm and friendly hand in our committee tasks.

Yes, we talked about Wallace White, the man, whose friendliness, charm, courtesy, and painstaking consideration in all things marked him as a true gentleman and a noble American patriot and one who had sacrificed opportunity for personal gain to serve the people.

We want you and your family to know these things, Wallace. We all join in this letter with our warmest and sincerest greetings and best wishes to you and yours,

Faithfully,

EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Chairman, ERNEST McFARLAND, WARREN MAGNUSON, BRIEN McMAHON, HERBERT O'CONOR, LYNDON JOHNSON, LESTER HUNT, CHARLES TOBEY, OWEN BREWSTER, HOMER CAPEHART, JOHN BRICKER, JOHN WILLIAMS, JAMES KEM.

We received from Mrs. White a lovely note. I know my colleagues realize how much this gracious lady appreciated the letter we had sent, and she expressed so beautifully her appreciation. She told of the emotions of Wallace White when he found that we had sent the letter. He was that sort of a person. He appreciated deeply any small thing that might be done. He never thought of consideration for himself in anything. When anyone showed consideration for him, it touched him deeply. That goes to show the character of this great American.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I came into the Chamber late, but I am glad to hear these tributes to our beloved friend who now has gone on, Wallace White.

I knew him for a great many years, and I count his personal friendship a great asset during my life.

It was my custom for many years to sit with him at a private table in the Senate restaurant. The conversations we had there were always an inspiration to me. We talked often about the deeper things of life.

I remember in particular one conversation I had with him. Wallace said, "I have always been especially touched by a passage from Bryant's Ode to a Waterfowl," and he quoted it:

He who, from zone to zone,

Guides through the boundless sky thy certain flight,

In the long way that I must tread alone,
Will lead my steps aright.

That was Wallace White's faith to the end. God bless his memory.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, just this morning I heard the sad news that was so distressing to all of us. I wish to add my brief word of tribute to one of the first men who befriended me when I was a freshman in the Senate, back in the fall of 1944. I had

hardly been elected to take the place of the late, lamented Warren Barbour before I first heard from Wallace White, who then was our minority leader, in instructing me in some of the details regarding our operations and responsibilities here.

I arrived in Washington in December, and Wallace was one of the first to come to see me and to tell me how much he welcomed me as an addition to the group he was representing.

I shall not forget that time after time he would relate to me various incidents in his own experience, thus helping to relate my work to that with which he had become so familiar during many years of service in both the House of Representatives and the Senate.

So I wish to add to the tributes which have been paid to him my own word of tribute, to express my deep affection for one of the dearest friends I have had since I have been in the Senate, and to convey to Mrs. White and to his family the deepest sympathies of my wife and myself at his sad passing.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, to what has been said about the late Senator Wallace White, I can bring a new slant to the testimony given of him: I came to the Senate just a few months before he retired. He was then actually floor leader for the Republican Members, who then had a majority in the Senate, although he was not able to be active in the discharge of those duties, I felt his influence on the floor and I realized his deep knowledge of legislative matters.

His was not what would ordinarily be called a forceful personality. He did not have a commanding voice or the other qualities which frequently are associated with influence and leadership. So I looked especially to see what was the source of his power.

It was not long before I discovered that it was based on the profound respect and the utmost confidence and esteem held for Senator White by every Member of this body. I have never seen a finer tribute to one man from others than the one given here one day soon before Wallace White's voluntary retirement, when the Senate rose and cheered as one man in tribute to him and his outstanding character.

To me he represented Americanism and he represented service in the United States Senate in the very loftiest phases and in the Senate's very finest tradition. This body and this country have profited much by this great man's unselfish service.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in tribute to the late Senator White. When I first came to the Senate he visited me, as he also visited the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. The advice and information which he gave me have been helpful to me every day I have been in the Senate. He was unassuming, yet positive, in his positions. His long service in the House and Senate in official capacities gave him an amount of information possessed by but few men.

I recall that in speaking to several freshmen Senators he stated that when he was secretary to his distinguished grandfather, who was a member of this body, if his grandfather received a total of ten or twelve letters a day he would complain because it was interfering with the performance of his legislative duties. He went on to describe how greatly the functions of the United States Senate has expanded during his 50 years in various capacities with the Congress. But he impressed upon all of us the fact that we must assume those added duties without bitterness, because it only evidenced the expansion of America. Wallace White was a fine friend, a great American and a profound Christian gentleman.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I was very much grieved to learn of the death of Senator Wallace White. I first knew him when I was in the Press Gallery and he was a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Maine. I served with him in the Senate from 1937 until he retired from public life.

Senator White made a very distinguished record as a public servant. He was a most active member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House, and the work he did in the field of communications will stand throughout history as a very fine monument to his intellectual powers and to his sense of dedication to public duty.

Beyond that, Senator White was a man of very warm heart. He was a loyal friend, and a high-minded public servant. He was my intimate friend and close companion for many years in the Senate.

I mourn his passing, and I extend my deepest sympathy to his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair dislikes often to take advantage of his position on the rostrum to make remarks on any subject, but he is sure the Senate will not begrudge him a word or two of tribute to one of his greatest friends.

I was grieved this morning before breakfast to receive a message from Mrs. White announcing Wallace's death. I appreciated her message as a recognition of the affectionate relationship which existed between him and me and between our families.

I served in the House of Representatives with him for 10 years, and served with him in the Senate from 1931 until he voluntarily retired. We sat opposite each other on these two front seats on two different sides of the aisle, during a very crucial period in the history of the country. I so profoundly appreciated his qualities, not only as a friend and a man but as a statesman, that I shall always cherish the cooperation which he exhibited on every occasion, which made my task easier as the majority leader of the Senate.

The exaltation of his spirit above petty things was something to inspire all his colleagues and all his friends, and, no doubt, inspired the people of Maine to honor him for so long a period and until he himself desired to retire.

In considering his life and his character and his public service, I can think of

only one poetic selection which seems to me to fit:

As some tall cliff that lifts its awful form,
Swells from the vale, and midway leaves the storm,
Though round its breast the rolling clouds
are spread,
Eternal sunshine settles on its head.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution offered by the junior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] for herself and the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF STATE RELATING TO UNITED STATES EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 410)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State on the operations of the Department of State under section 2 of Public Law 584, Seventy-ninth Congress, as required by that law.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 31, 1952.

(Enclosure: Report from the Secretary of State concerning Public Law 584.)

REPORT OF GIRL SCOUTS OF AMERICA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the President and National Executive Director, Girl Scouts of the United States of America, New York, N. Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Girl Scouts for the calendar year 1951, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITION

Mr. EASTLAND presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 3

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to amend the Dependency Allotment Act of 1950 to permit dependents of members of the Armed Forces to qualify for class Q allotments in hardship cases

Whereas the provisions of the Dependency Allotment Act of 1950, it is felt, are not realistic in preventing the allowance of class Q allotments to dependents of service men and women in the Armed Forces of the United States, especially in the case of needy and unemployable parents of such service men and women; and

Whereas by the lowering of the draft age, young men are being drafted out of the classroom at high school or college who have not, under the circumstances, had the opportunity to contribute at least 50 percent of the support for either or both parents or a widowed mother, as required in most cases by said Dependency Allotment Act of 1950; and

Whereas, the rigid enforcement of this requirement that a service man or woman must have contributed at least 50 percent to the support of such parent or parents prior to his or her entry into the service is, in our judgment, resulting in extreme hardship to such parent or parents who in many cases are physically incapacitated to earn a living and therefore unable to support themselves; and

Whereas this condition is not due to any fault or lapse of duty on the part of such service man or woman whose full services are pledged to the defense of this Republic: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi (the Senate concurring therein), That the Honorable Congress of the United States is hereby earnestly requested to take such immediate and effective steps as may be necessary to release, in proper cases, the requirement of prior contribution by the serviceman to the support of his parents and to make no demand on the serviceman that he prove such prior contribution to the support of his parents in those cases in which the ill health or unemployable status of his parents has resulted subsequent to the induction or enlistment of such serviceman; be it further

Resolved, That said Dependency Allotment Act of 1950 be so amended as to provide that, in proper cases, a necessary investigation of facts be undertaken by a suitable agency in those cases in which there is doubt as to entitlement to such class Q allotments, and that the Armed Forces be bound by the facts as reflected in those findings; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the presiding officers of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States, to the individual members of the Committee on Armed Services, and that the clerk of the house of representatives of the State of Mississippi be directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to each Member representing Mississippi in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and further that the clerk of the house of representatives of the State of Mississippi be directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the representatives of the press.

Adopted by the Senate, February 20, 1952.

CARROLL GARTIN,

President of the Senate.

Adopted by the House of Representatives, January 9, 1952.

WALTER SILLERS,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH—RESOLUTION OF POST 17, AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF NEBRASKA, SIDNEY, NEBR.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by Post No. 17, the American Legion, Department of Nebraska, of Sidney, Nebr., protesting against the enactment of the bill (S. 1140) to establish and to consolidate certain hospital, medical, and public-health functions of the Government in a Department of Health.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the American Legion Post No. 17, Sidney, Nebr., of the Department of Ne-

braska, at its regular meeting, held on Tuesday, March 25, 1952, considered Senate bill No. 1140 of the Senate of the United States of America; and

Whereas said measure proposes to merge Veterans' hospital facilities with other Federal projects under a singular Federal Department of Health; and

Whereas the following action of the said American Legion Post No. 17 represents the concerted view of 500 regular and qualified members of said post; and

Whereas said matter was considered pro and con from all points of view: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by said American Legion Post No. 17, Sidney, Nebr., Department of Nebraska, That Honorable Senators HUGH BUTLER and FRED SEATON be informed of the action of said American Legion Post; that said Senators be advised that said American Legion Post No. 17 is unalterably opposed to the passage of said measure for the following reasons, to wit:

1. Said measure is a disguised attempt of the present administration to invade the field of private medical practice and hospitalization by the establishment of a Federal Department of Health.

2. Said measure is a direct attempt to eliminate veterans' benefits which were established approximately 30 years prior to this date.

3. That said measure would deny all veterans of said hospitalization and treatment. Any economies realized by such a program would be at the direct expense of a singular group rather than resulting from economies in Government. Further, veterans of all wars would surrender certain benefits by elimination of former acts of Congress.

This is to certify that the above resolution was passed and adopted by said post at the time and place set forth above. Dated this 25th day of March, 1952.

CARL CHRIST, JR.,

Post Commander.

Attest:

LEONARD J. MOSEMAN,

Adjutant.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—MESSAGES AND RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am glad once more today to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate a series of messages and a resolution forwarded to me by grass roots organizations and officials in the Midwest on behalf of passage of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of these splendid messages and resolution be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a further indication of the desire of America's citizenry to see prompt action on Senate Resolution 27.

There being no objection, the messages and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LADIES AUXILIARY,

MILK AND ICE CREAM DRIVERS AND

DAIRY EMPLOYEES UNION,

Milwaukee, Wis.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The members of the Milk and Ice Cream Auxiliary, No. 225, urge you to continue your efforts in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway.

Very truly yours,

(Mrs. Geo.) IRENE SCANLON.

CITY OF ELKHORN,
Elkhorn, Wis., March 28, 1952.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you concerning the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. It is my opinion that the participation of the United States in this project and its early completion are of the highest importance, not only to the Great Lakes region and the Middle West but also to our whole Nation as well as Canada. I understand that the project has your personal support in the Congress, but it is my sincere hope that the short-sighted sectionalism which seems to obscure the reasoning of some of our legislators will not be permitted to defeat the project and hereby endanger and impair the future welfare of our country. I trust that you will make a vigorous effort to obtain early and favorable congressional action relative to this project.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. WILSON,
Mayor of the City of Elkhorn.

TWELFTH STREET AND VLIET STREET
ADVANCEMENT ASSOCIATION,
Milwaukee, Wis., March 27, 1952.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: This letter is directed to you in behalf of our association which at its last meeting went on record as favoring the St. Lawrence seaway.

We respectfully request that every consideration be given by you in the promotion of this project.

With kindest regards, I remain,
Very truly yours,

JOHN L. DOYNE,
Executive Secretary.

WOMEN'S AUXILIARY,
IRON WORKERS, LOCAL
No. 471, A. F. OF L.,
Milwaukee, Wis., March 29, 1952.

DEAR SENATOR: As secretary of the Women's Auxiliary, Iron Workers, Local No. 471, A. F. of L., I wish to express to you our request that you vote in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway bill.

Fraternally,

ELIZABETH HOLZ,
Secretary.

VILLAGE OF GREENDALE, STATE OF WISCONSIN—
RESOLUTION No. R52-5

Whereas the St. Lawrence River development will benefit greatly the entire United States and is of national concern: Be it

Resolved, That the Village Board of Greendale urges the Congress of the United States to approve the St. Lawrence seaway and power project and ratify the 1941 agreement with Canada concerning that project; be it further

Resolved, That the action of the Village Board of Greendale be communicated to Congress and our Representatives therein.

Adopted this 11th day of March 1952.

ROMAN H. KACZMAREK,
President.
MARY LOU MEISENHEIMER,
Clerk.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 2948. A bill for the relief of Clementina Ferrara, Maria Garofalo, Rosetta Savino, Maria Serra, Albina Zamunner, and Fedora

Gazzarrini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 2949. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 2950. A bill to amend section 4527, Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. O'CONOR when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 2951. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the initial phase of the Snake River reclamation project by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 2952. A bill to provide for the return to the former owners of certain lands acquired in connection with the Fort Peck Dam project of mineral interests in such lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and Mr. STENNIS):

S. 2953. A bill to regulate the repayment to the United States of advances made to the States and local subdivisions thereof under title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. MCFARLAND):

S. 2954. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment on certain claims of individual Navajo Indians against the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MCCARRAN:

S. 2955. A bill for the relief of Blanca Ibarra and Dolores Ibarra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2956. A bill to create the office of Senator at Large for former Presidents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 2957. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to prescribe circumstances under which the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system may be extended to State and local employees who are covered by retirement systems; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 2958. A bill for the relief of Setsuko Ohara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCKELLAR:

S. 2959. A bill authorizing the transfer to the State of Tennessee of certain lands in the Veterans Administration Center, Mountain Home, Tenn.; to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 4527, REVISED STATUTES, RELATING TO WAGES OF CREW MEMBERS OF CERTAIN VESSELS

MR. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which relates to the wages of crew members when the voyage of a vessel is completed in less than 1 month. I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2950) to amend section 4527, Revised Statutes, introduced by Mr. O'CONOR, was read twice by its title,

and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. O'CONOR is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

By the act of June 7, 1872 (title 46, USCA; sec. 594), a seaman signing on articles for a voyage in the foreign or in the intercoastal trades is presently entitled, under section 4527 (Rev. Stat.) to receive a sum equal to 1 month's wages in addition to any wages actually earned, if he is discharged without fault on his part and without his consent before the commencement of the voyage or before 1 month's wages are earned.

The present law was enacted in 1872, when commerce was carried on largely by sailing ships and voyages of the character described covering long periods of time were universal. The fast turn-around and short voyages of modern, high-powered vessels of the present day—80 years later—was not contemplated.

In the present day of fast, modern ships, there are many voyages in these trades on regular schedules which are completed in less than the 30-day period specified in the act of 1872. This is particularly true of tankers, where quick loading and discharging permits fast turn-around, and substantially reduces the over-all voyage duration. Certainly no penalty should be exacted because of the evolution of ship design, speed, and efficiency, and none, of course, was intended by the original statute.

The Federal courts have recently held, and certiorari has been denied by the Supreme Court, that seamen signed off at the end of a voyage of less than 1 month's duration are entitled to recover the statutory amount of 1 month's wages, in addition to wages actually earned, even though they accept continued and uninterrupted employment on the same vessel for another voyage. The courts themselves recognize the obsolete character of the provision, but have stated that the only remedy "is to seek amendment of this antiquated enactment, which in many features produces the effects which are anachronistic."

Such a remedy is sought by the bill I have introduced. The bill strikes from the section the provision which gives a seaman 1 month's penalty wages (in addition to wages actually earned) where the voyage is completed and the seaman signed off the articles prior to 1 month. My bill leaves the statute otherwise unchanged and it does not disturb the provision that the seaman is entitled to 1 month's penalty wages if discharged after employment and prior to the commencement of the voyage, without fault on his part.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 7216) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. UNDERWOOD:

Address delivered by the Vice President at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner held at

the National Guard Armory, Washington, D. C., March 29, 1952.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

Statement prepared by him regarding the placement by the Railroad Retirement Board of Navajo Indians in the railroad industry and its effect on the Indian economy.

Address delivered by Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marin at the final session of the Puerto Rican Constitutional Convention, February 6, 1952.

By Mr. MOODY:

Statement prepared by him regarding the meaning of Greek Independence Day.

Editorial entitled "Seaway Rejection Puzzles Dominion," written by James S. Pooler, and published in the Detroit Free Press, March 18, 1952.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

Announcement by the Secretary of Agriculture of wool-support-price plan.

By Mr. TOBEY:

Address delivered by Robert R. Young, chairman, Federation of Railway Progress, at Waldorf-Astoria on March 20, 1952.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Radio broadcast by Paul Harvey, entitled "The American Legion," from Chicago, March 16, 1952.

By Mr. BRICKER:

Article entitled "Perils of Treaties," written by Raymond Moley and published in the Los Angeles Times, February 26, 1952.

Editorial entitled "ILO, International Trap," published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of March 14, 1952.

Editorial entitled "'Absurd' Is the Word," published in the Akron Beacon-Journal of March 15, 1952.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Report on the Newbold Morris hearings entitled "Not a Wet Eye in the House," written by Holmes Alexander, and published in the Los Angeles Times of March 18, 1952.

By Mr. NIXON:

Article entitled "Morris Becomes One Probed—Not Prober," written by Peter Edson, and recently published in the Rapid City (S. Dak.) Daily Journal.

By Mr. WILEY:

Editorial entitled "Thought Control," written by David Lawrence, and published in the U. S. News & World Report of April 4, 1952, dealing with the recommendation of the Wage Stabilization Board for compulsory membership in unions.

JACKSON-JEFFERSON DAY ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I had intended to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the outstanding address delivered by the President of the United States at the Jackson-Jefferson Day dinner last Saturday. However, I understand the address has already been ordered printed in the RECORD in response to a request by Mr. McCormick in the House of Representatives, and I shall not ask to have it duplicated.

LEGAL ASPECTS OF THE YALTA AGREEMENT—STATEMENT BY STEPHEN C. Y. PAN

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, during the course of the debate on the Japanese Peace Treaty I placed in the RECORD an article by Dr. Stephen C. Y. Pan entitled "Legal Aspects of the Yalta Agreement," which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 18, 1952, at pages 2456 to 2461. At that time, through inadvertence, I did not mention

that the article had been printed in the American Journal of International Law. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks a short letter from George A. Finch, editor in chief of the American Society of International Law, dated March 26, 1952, thanking me for having caused the article to be printed in the RECORD, and calling attention to the oversight.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF
INTERNATIONAL LAW,
Washington, D. C., March 26, 1952.
Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Senate Office Building, the Capitol,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: We were honored to note that you had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 18 during the debate on the Japanese Peace Treaty the full text of the article by Dr. Stephen C. Y. Pan entitled "Legal Aspects of the Yalta Agreement." Through some inadvertence, the printer failed to state the publication from which the article was reprinted. The article was published in the American Journal of International Law for January 1952, pages 40-59. We would naturally wish to have the source of the article appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

GEO. A. FINCH,
Editor in Chief.

ARMED FORCES PAY RAISE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5715) to amend sections 201 (a), 301 (e), 302 (f), 302 (g), 508, 527 and 528 of Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate has under consideration as the unfinished business House bill 5715, upon which, by unanimous consent, a limitation of debate has been agreed to, namely, 40 minutes on amendments, motions, appeals, and so forth, to be equally divided, and 1 hour on the bill. At the present there is only one amendment pending. That is the committee amendment, which is a complete substitute for the House bill, and which will be regarded as the text of the bill for purposes of amendment. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am not trying to drum up business by way of amendments to the bill. There have been several amendments which have been printed. I assumed that Senators would like to offer their amendments. Of course, I am ready to vote at the present time. I think the committee substitute is in about as good a shape as we can get it; but I do not wish to appear to be unfair to any Member of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I should like to call up my amendment D, of March 17, 1952.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). The clerk will state the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, between lines 12 and 13, it is proposed to insert the following new subsection:

(g) Section 509 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 is amended to read as follows:

"ASSIMILATION TO PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF PERSONNEL OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES"

"Sec. 509. The provisions of titles II and III of this act shall apply equally to those persons serving, not as personnel of any of the uniformed services, but whose pay or allowances, or both, under existing law or regulation promulgated pursuant to law are assimilated to the pay and allowances of commissioned officers, warrant officers, or enlisted persons of any rank or grade of any of the uniformed services."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, this is a technical amendment which extends the benefits of the bill to those in the maritime service whose salaries are determined as are the salaries of the personnel in the Coast Guard. I think it was the intention of the bill not to change basic law.

Mr. RUSSELL. The statement made by the Senator from Colorado is eminently correct. The compensation of officers in the maritime service is fixed in the same amount as is the compensation of their opposites in grade in the Military Establishment. The act should be applicable to officers in the maritime service. Therefore, Mr. President, I am willing to accept the amendment, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. To whom does it apply?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Colorado could answer that question better than I could, but it applies to officers of the maritime service who are on duty with the Maritime Administration.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator refer to the Maritime Commission?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What do they have to do with the Army or the Navy?

Mr. RUSSELL. A commander in the merchant marine service, under existing law, draws the same compensation as that of a commander in the Coast Guard. The pay of officers is fixed at the same grade as that of their opposites in the Coast Guard. It seems to me to be fair that the bill should apply to them, inasmuch as their compensation is controlled by the amount of compensation paid to their opposites in the Coast Guard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. During peacetime the Coast Guard, as the Senator knows, works under the Treasury Department, and the personnel receive the same pay as those in the Navy, because in time of war they are likely to be called into service under the Navy. They have always been and should be kept together.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How many persons are involved in the amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. There are very few. I will furnish the information to the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Would the Senator say there would be as many as one hundred thousand?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Oh, no.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How many—one thousand? Can the Senator approximate the number?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should think the number would be perhaps up to 500.

Mr. RUSSELL. My information is that only 300 or 400 persons would be affected.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does it apply only to officers?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am advised it applies also to enlisted men.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It seems to me the RECORD ought to show a little information concerning the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I agree with the Senator. When the amendment was first proposed, I requested that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, presided over by the distinguished Senator from Colorado, because my committee had never dealt with this subject. His committee investigated the matter and recommended that the amendment be added to the bill. It applies to graduates of the merchant marine academies of which there are two or three in the country. In the school at King's Point officers are trained—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does not the Senator think the amendment should be examined further?

Mr. RUSSELL. It has been examined. When it came to the Committee on Armed Services, I immediately forwarded it to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in order that that committee might examine it. That committee recommended that the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How much will the operation of the amendment cost?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have sent for information. If the Senator desires, I will withdraw the amendment. I sent for the information before I called up the amendment, but the Senator in charge of the bill suggested that whatever amendments are on the desk should be offered at the present time. The information for which I sent has not yet reached me. More than an hour ago I asked for the information, and the delay is due to this being the lunch hour. The Senator from Arkansas is entirely correct. The RECORD should show the whole story. I will withhold the amendment until I have the desired information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Colorado may withdraw his amendment.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have debated this bill as long as I think is desirable. I have nothing further to say about it. I believe the Senator from Michigan has an amendment he desires to offer. However, I notice that the Senator from Illinois has now come on the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I had an agreement with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Moody], who was going

to offer a modified form of the so-called Long amendment this afternoon. I join with the Senator from Michigan in his amendment, and before I proceed with my own amendment, I think he should have the right-of-way.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, on Friday the distinguished Senator from Louisiana offered an amendment which would in effect provide—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has no amendment pending.

Mr. MOODY. On behalf of myself, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Ives], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], I submit an amendment to the pending bill, H. R. 5715.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

Mr. MOODY. This is an amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan desire the amendment to be read in full?

Mr. MOODY. No; but I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment offered by Mr. Moody, for himself and other Senators, is as follows:

On page 4, strike out all in lines 18 to 20, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That this act may be cited as the 'Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1952.'"

"TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE CAREER COMPENSATION ACT OF 1949

"Sec. 101. (a) The table contained in section 201 (a) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 is amended to read as follows:—

On page 7, line 13, strike out the section number "2" and insert in lieu thereof the section number "102."

On page 7, line 19, strike out the word "act" and insert in lieu thereof the word "title."

On page 7, line 24, strike out the word "act" and insert in lieu thereof the word "title."

On page 8, line 1, strike out the section number "3" and insert in lieu thereof the section number "103."

On page 8, line 1, strike out the word "act" and insert in lieu thereof the word "title."

On page 8, immediately after line 3, insert the following:

"TITLE II—COMBAT-DUTY PAY

"Sec. 201. This title may be cited as the 'Combat-Duty Pay Act of 1952.'

"Sec. 202. As used in this title—

"(a) The terms 'uniformed services,' 'member,' 'officer,' and 'secretary' (except as hereinafter specifically provided) shall have the meaning prescribed for such terms by

section 102 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, and the terms 'incentive pay' and 'special pay' shall mean the pay authorized by section 203, 204, or 205 of such act.

"(b) The term 'member,' when used in relation to any combat unit, means any member of the uniformed services serving and present with, or on board, such unit under competent orders.

"(c) The term 'combat unit' means—

"(1) any military unit, not larger than a regiment, while such unit is engaged in actual combat on land; or

"(2) any element of, or detail of personnel from, any military unit not larger than a regiment, while such element or detail is subjected to hostile ground fire in the course of rendering aid or assistance (A) directly to a military unit, not larger than a battalion, which is engaged in actual combat on land, or (B) by fire to any military unit engaged in actual combat on land; or

"(3) any military unit (not larger than a regiment) engaged in any amphibious or airborne operation, while subjected to hostile ground fire in the course of rendering aid or assistance, to a military unit which is engaged in actual combat on land, by the performance of duties which require its employment at or near a beach or airhead; or

"(4) any vessel while subjected to hostile fire or explosion in the course of any operation; or

"(5) any aircraft while subjected to hostile fire in the course of any operation.

"(d) The term 'actual combat on land' means direct contact with and opposition to a hostile force by any military unit while such unit is subjected to hostile ground fire.

"(e) The term 'military unit' means any unit of any of the uniformed services other than a vessel or aircraft.

"(f) The term 'Korea' shall mean the geographical area specified for income-tax-exemption purposes by Executive Order 10195, approved December 20, 1950.

"Sec. 203. Each member and former member of the uniformed services shall be entitled to receive combat pay in the amount of \$45 per month for enlisted persons and officers for each month beginning after May 31, 1950, for which such member was entitled to receive basic pay and during which he was a member of a combat unit in Korea on—

"(a) not less than 6 days of such month; or

"(b) one or more days of such month included within a period of not less than six consecutive days on which he was a member of a combat unit in Korea, if such period began in the next preceding month and he is not entitled to receive combat pay under this act for such preceding month.

"Sec. 204. Each member and former member of the uniformed services shall be entitled to receive combat pay in the amount of \$45 per month for enlisted persons and officers for each month beginning after May 31, 1950, for which he was entitled to receive basic pay and in which—

"(a) he was killed in action, injured in action, or wounded in action while serving as a member of a combat unit in Korea, and for not more than 3 months thereafter during which he was hospitalized for the treatment of an injury or wound received in action while so serving; or

"(b) he was captured or entered a missing-in-action status while serving as a member of a combat unit in Korea, and for not more than 3 months thereafter during which he occupied such status;

"Sec. 205. No person shall be entitled to receive for any month—

"(a) more than one combat pay authorized by this title; or

"(b) combat pay under this title in addition to pay incentive or special pay.

"SEC. 206. (a) The Secretaries of the services concerned are authorized and directed to promulgate regulations for the administration of this title, which regulations shall be as uniform as practicable, and in the case of the military departments shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense.

"(b) Such regulations may include appropriate provisions for the withholding of combat pay under section 203 of this title from any member or former member of the uniformed services (or any class of such persons) for any period during which such person or class of persons was not placed in substantial peril by the action of any hostile force, as determined in conformity with such regulations.

"SEC. 207. (a) The Secretary of the service concerned, or such subordinates as he may specify, may make such determinations as may be required for the administration of this title, and all determinations and payments made hereunder shall be final and conclusive, and shall not be subject to review by any court or any accounting officer of the Government.

"(b) Appropriations currently available for pay and allowances of members of the uniformed services shall be available for the payment of combat pay under this title for any month prior to the date of enactment of this title."

Mr. MOODY. No, Mr. President. If I may, I should like to explain that this amendment is the same as the Long amendment, except that it changes the basic rate of \$50 to \$45. As Senators know, the Long amendment was offered on Friday and was rejected by a standing vote, with comparatively few Members of the Senate present.

As the Senate also knows, it is a practice to pay what is known as hazard pay for hazardous duties in our Armed Forces. The distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has an amendment, which I intend to support, readjusting the levels of some of the hazard pay.

It seems to me a highly fantastic situation to say that others in the Armed Forces should be recompensed for hazards, when men who are now fighting in Korea get no hazard or combat pay.

I fully understand the reasons why the Senator from Louisiana did not press for a yeas-and-nays vote on Friday. I feel that the proper figure may perhaps be \$45 instead of \$50. I have discussed this matter with other Senators, and I can see no reason why the Senate should not recognize the fact that if anybody is in danger today, it is the men who are being shot at by the Communists.

I hope the Senate will adopt this amendment and do so in conjunction with amendments which will be offered in a few minutes by the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan for himself and other Senators.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator from Illinois wish to charge the time for the call of a quorum?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair hear a second to the request for the yeas and nays?

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, is it not possible to put this amendment to a vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say to the Senator from Michigan that that is what is being done at the present time.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan. [Putting the question.]

The "noes" appear to have it—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, the time to be shared equally between the Senator from Michigan and the other group of Senators.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I should not like the RECORD to show that there were not sufficient Senators present who are interested to vote upon the amendment; therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I assume that none of this time is to be charged to the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; it is not chargeable to either proponent.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bennett	Hoey	O'Connor
Bridges	Holland	O'Mahoney
Butler, Md.	Hunt	Pastore
Capehart	Ives	Robertson
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Douglas	Long	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	McFarland	Sparkman
Ellender	Millikin	Stennis
Ferguson	Moody	Thye
Frear	Mundt	Tobey
Hayden	Murray	Underwood
Hendrickson	Neely	Young
Hill	Nixon	

Mr. McFARLAND. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent because of illness.

Mr. BRIDGES. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAIN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ECTON, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LODGE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. SCHOEPPLE, Mr. SEATON, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WELKER, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. WILLIAMS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I request the yeas and nays.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to inquire whether it is the intention of the Committee on Armed Services to accept the amendment. No member of the committee has risen in opposition to the amendment. Am I to understand that the members of the committee have given tacit consent to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan? I hope this is the case. If these bonuses for so-called hazard and incentive pay are to be given to others, then combat troops should get them as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the Senator's inquiry is not a parliamentary inquiry. The Senator from Illinois is out of order.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I can well understand why no Senator has opposed the amendment. It should be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested. Is the request sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

The Senate proceeded to divide, Senators favoring the amendment rising.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont will state it.

Mr. FLANDERS. Which amendment is the Senate voting on now? I realize that it is an amendment providing combat pay, but which amendment is it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Mooney] for himself and other Senators. It is the same as the Long amendment, which was rejected on Friday, with the exception that the amount is reduced from \$50 a month to \$45 a month.

Mr. FLANDERS. Is the amendment offered in lieu of the Long amendment, or is it an amendment to the Long amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Long amendment was rejected on Friday. The Chair presumes that the pending amendment is offered in lieu of the Long amendment.

Senators who have been counted will be seated. Those who oppose the amendment will rise and stand until counted.

On the division being completed, the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I send to the desk my amendment identified as 3-28-52-C.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, immediately following line 24, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 3. Subsection (b) of section 204 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) For the performance of hazardous duty as prescribed in part (1) or (2) of subsection (a) of this section, members of the uniformed services qualifying for the incentive pay authorized pursuant to said subsection shall be entitled to be paid at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 8, line 1, strike out "3" and insert in lieu thereof "4."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I may say that this is the amendment which is labeled "A" on the mimeographed sheet which lies on the desks of Senators. It would reduce the bonuses which are paid presently for personnel on flight and submarine duty. The Senate has just adopted what I believe to be a very worth-while amendment, providing combat pay for those who are actually in combat. It is something that should have been done a long time ago. I congratulate the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Mooney] for submitting the amendment, and the Senate for adopting it. The amendment provides simple justice. It will cost between \$90,000,000 and \$100,000,000 a year more; but I believe it will be money well spent.

However, Mr. President, while we are dealing with the subject of bonus pay, we should not merely make additions, but we should also remove abuses and excessive payments which already exist in the system of bonus pay. On other occasions I have tried to point out to the Senate what some of the abuses are.

In the first place, I think one gross abuse is that administrative officers are taken into the air a minimum of 4 hours a month, with a yearly total of at least 100 hours a year, and receive for it the full flight bonus. The "chair corps," if I may say so, likes to get in on the "gravy plane"; and, all over the country, there is a huge "chair corps," composed of officers who get the Air Corps bonuses.

The bonuses now being paid amount, in all, to \$270,000,000 a year. A large proportion of these bonuses goes to administrative officers who are not actually assigned to flying duty, but who get into the air primarily as copassengers sitting beside the pilots, and sometimes are logged as copilots or navigators, frequently in small training planes.

In an article which appeared in yesterday's Washington Star, on page 4, it was stated, apparently on good authority, that there are, in this area alone, 1,800 Air Force officers of the so-called chair corps, who fly on week ends and in off hours, and therefore qualify for the extra pay, which ranges generally between \$100 and \$210 a month for officers.

The Air Force reports that scattered throughout its stations are 20,000 of its personnel who get in on the gravy plane, in addition—and I emphasize the fact that it is in addition—to their base pay, their quarters' allowance, and their subsistence allowance.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield, to permit me to propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry, namely, whether a motion to recommit this bill would be in order at any time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such a motion would be in order at any time the Senator who wished to make the motion could obtain the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am not asking for the floor now; I simply wish to ask at this time whether during the further proceedings in the Senate, after the Senator from Illinois concludes his remarks, a motion to recommit would be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that such a motion would be in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Chair.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, last fall I tried to attack this problem by means of raising the minimum requirement for qualification for flight pay from 4 hours a month to 20 hours a month, in order that this payment might be confined to bona fide flyers, and might not be received by those simply desiring to qualify for the bonuses. That amendment was adopted by the Senate, as my colleagues will recall, but, because of the opposition of the Air Force, the amendment was defeated in conference, and the previous system continued unchanged.

Mr. President, all of us know this to be a great abuse. Anyone who has been in the armed services, anyone who has been around an air base, knows of the groups of administrative officers and

ground officers who are ever ready to be taken into the air in order to qualify for and to receive the extra flight pay.

However, pay is not all that is involved in this matter; extra gasoline consumption and extra wear and tear on the planes are also involved. Any one of us who cares to go to Bolling Field can see the large number of planes the Government furnishes to administrative officers so they can go into the air 4 hours a month and thus be able to receive this extra pay. So the total costs are far in excess of the amount of the actual bonuses paid.

Mr. President, it will be very difficult to strike at that abuse by fixing a requirement of a total number of hours. However, this year we are taking a new tack: We are trying to say that all those who receive air and submarine bonuses shall receive the same amount a private receives for such service; in other words, if there is a risk—and let me say that the risk is grossly exaggerated in the case of submarine service—the officer shall receive for the risk he takes no more than the private does.

I may point out that in the Long-Moody amendment which the Senate has just adopted we have followed the very correct principle that when under fire men are equal; and that the captain, the major, or the colonel should receive no more by way of hazard compensation than the private receives, namely, \$45 a month.

The amendment I offer provides that in the Air Corps and in the submarine service no officer shall receive more in the form of what is called hazard pay than is received by an enlisted man. Of course an officer will receive a larger amount of base pay a larger quarters allowance and a larger subsistence allowance. However, on the basis of danger, all men would be equal.

This amendment would save over \$140,000,000. By means of the amendment we could save enough to pay for the bonus for combat service, which the Senate has just approved, and in addition, bring about a \$50,000,000 saving.

Here is a chance to combine justice and economy and to eliminate from the armed services one of the festering abuses which make men indignant and lower the morale of the whole service.

So, Mr. President, I hope very much this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I am very much disturbed about this particular amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield time to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, the Senator who is in charge of the bill does not seem to be on the floor at this time.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, however, I wish to address myself to this amendment, if I may have unanimous consent from the Senate to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Wyoming may proceed.

The time he uses will be charged to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I believe it was on Friday morning that the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee called a meeting for the sole purpose of studying the question of the hazard pay given to administrative officials for flight time. We were briefed by two officers of the Military Establishment, Vice Admiral Cassidy for the Navy and General Hopwood for the Air Force.

I wish to say to the Senate that those hearings were called absolutely without any information or knowledge of the fact that the Senator from Illinois was going to submit this amendment. So I wish the Senator from Illinois to understand—for I believe he thinks otherwise—that there is absolutely no connection whatsoever between his amendments and the beginning of the hearings on Friday.

Mr. President, we have not completed the hearings. I think it would be a very serious mistake—and I say this judging from my own knowledge as a member of the Armed Services Committee—for those of us on the floor of the Senate, uninformed on this matter except for what we obtained in general terms from the Senator from Illinois, to vote on such a very important question.

For instance, I know of a situation where certain officers on duty at the Pentagon have supervision and direction over a great number of pilots. For those officers not to have flying time, but still to be in complete control and charge of officers who are flying, seems to me not to make sense.

The amendment the Senator from Illinois has submitted would reduce the amount of so-called hazardous-duty pay for participation in regular aerial flights and for submarine duty to \$30 a month for each individual.

Prior to the Career Compensation Act, such hazardous-duty pay was computed at the rate of 50 percent of the base pay of the individual concerned. Under that system, flight pay and submarine pay varied from \$37.50 a month, for a private, to approximately \$365 a month for a major general.

The Career Compensation Act completely revised the computation of such pay, by substituting a flat rate for each grade. That rate is considerably less than the 50 percent of base pay. The present rates vary from \$30 a month for a private to \$75 a month for a master sergeant. The present rates for officers begin at \$100 a month for second lieutenants, and increase progressively to \$210 a month for colonels. The rate then drops back to \$150 a month for generals and admirals on flying or submarine duty.

At the time of the committee's recommendation regarding reductions in flight and submarine pay, as provided in the Career Compensation Act, evidence was submitted to the committee that those reductions might wreck the flying and submarine service, although since the enactment of that measure I am not aware of any particular difficulties in obtaining personnel to perform those duties.

My personal reaction is that there may be some merit to the contention of the Senator from Illinois that hazardous-duty pay can be reduced, although to my way of thinking there should not be a reduction so drastic as that which his amendment would provide.

One of the arguments used for such pay has always been the extremely high insurance rates for members of the Armed Forces performing such duty. The Government now provides \$10,000 insurance, without cost, to all individuals in the military services. I repeat, I regret that the Senator has offered this amendment to a bill providing a cost-of-living increase to all military personnel.

Mr. President, I am of the opinion that if we are to chop this bill to pieces, a bill on which the armed services have spent so much time and given so much study, the best thing for us to do would be to send it back to the committee, rather than vote on a subject with which we are not familiar, and in plain terms, about which we know very little. Doubtless many of those assigned to duty as pilots and in submarine work chose those branches of the service regardless of pay, while to others additional pay is a predominating factor. I do not know the proportion of officers in these two categories, but, as the Senator knows, aviation and submarine services are extremely important segments of our military forces, and I am sure he has no desire to do serious injury to either one or to our military forces in general.

Frankly, I do not know what the results of the Senator's amendment might be. I am sure the Senator will agree that it would be preferable to have the Armed Services Committee consider a matter so important as is his amendment before its adoption, and therefore I was hoping the Senator would not press this amendment.

I believe that the amendment should be in the form of a bill which would be referred to and considered by the Armed Services Committee. The committee should conduct hearings on it, and it should be reported back to this body and acted on as a clean bill, not as an amendment to the bill which is now before the Senate.

The cream of the Russian youth compete for flying duty in the Soviet Air Force; consequently, educational and physical standards are much higher than those of the ground forces.

The reason for the great attractiveness of a flying career and the resultant competition may be summed up in one word, incentives. In the case of Russia they take the following form. I shall list a few of them: Length of service of flying officer counts double toward retirement; Soviet air forces receive their scale No. 5, which is the best one granted to any personnel in the Soviet armed forces. The aviation hospitals are much finer than the hospitals provided for the ground forces; an air force lieutenant who is a pilot receives a base pay of 1,250 rubles a month, while a lieutenant in the infantry receives approximately only half the amount. The officers are paid

according to the position they hold, as well as according to rank. If a captain is holding a major's job, he is given a major's pay; and all flying officers receive in addition to the normal annual leave, 30 days, which must be spent in a rest camp.

In Germany, air force officers are allowed two leaves a year of 45 days' duration, plus a certain number of days of travel time.

I cite these facts merely to show that in some other countries service as an aviator is considered to be rather a preferred position in the military establishment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming be willing to yield for a question in my time?

Mr. HUNT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wondered whether, citing the superior privileges of the Russian air troops as compared to ground troops, he would not suggest to our department of propaganda that they use that fact as propaganda with the Russian ground troops? That might sow some dissatisfaction with the infantry.

Mr. HUNT. I think I can answer the Senator in this way: He probably is aware of the fact that a major general in the Army of the United States gets approximately 12 times the salary of a brigadier general in the Russian Army. In other words, the salary of an American brigadier general for 1 month is equivalent to that of a Russian general for 12 months.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wonder whether the Senator would inform us whether there is bonus pay for the British Royal Air Force, as compared to the ground troops?

Mr. HUNT. I am uninformed as to that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. My information is that there is only a slight differential for the British air force. I wonder whether the Senator from Wyoming would inform us what the pay was in the German Luftwaffe, whether the German air force received differentials over the ground forces?

Mr. HUNT. I am unadvised; but I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that we have always been able, I think, to give to the United States a better Air Force—better trained, better equipped, and in every way superior—than have the other countries to which he refers.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am merely mentioning this because the Senator from Wyoming quoted the Russian practice as an argument why an American aviator should receive superior advantages to those received by ground troops. It is my opinion that in the British and German forces only a minor distinction was drawn between the services. The American system is almost unique, I think, among the forces of the world. Of course, no one would object to liberal leave allowances for aviators; they should have liberal leave allowances. The question is simply one of pay.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, recently, in taking the testimony of General Hopgood and Admiral Cassidy, a question substantially in this form was asked:

Do those in important administrative positions who receive this bonus pay have charge of flying plans, and of making up the organization for attack, and things of that kind? Do they receive this incentive pay?

The answer was, substantially: Yes, they do.

They were then asked, in substance: How would the pilots under those men feel, knowing that their superior officers were not flying officers?

It seemed to me to be a very strong argument for continuing to allow these men to receive this incentive pay, at least until we have hearings on this matter and can report to the Senate a clean bill with reference to it.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUNT. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. I realize that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, as a member of the committee, is much better informed on this subject than some of the others of us, but I am curious to know, since the Senator from Illinois proposed such an amendment a year ago, and since it was adopted by the Senate, as I remember, but was eliminated in conference, why this matter which should be the subject of hearings before the committee, and why hearings had been held on the question?

Mr. HUNT. There was no bill on the subject before the committee. During the past few months hearings on various questions have been conducted by the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, but the subcommittee had no opportunity to get around to the proposals of the Senator from Illinois. We had been quite busy looking into other matters of importance. But I want to say to the Senator that the Senate subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee had no idea, no thought, and no suggestion that the Senator from Illinois was going to propose this amendment. In fact, the pending bill was made the unfinished business of the Senate only within a few days. This particular bill had not even been assigned for consideration Friday and today; so we had no way of even knowing that it was coming up for some time.

Mr. MOODY. The Senator from Wyoming knew, of course, that this amendment was adopted a year ago by the Senate, but was eliminated in conference. Certainly I think there is an excellent point to be made as to the differences, for example, in the degree of hazard undergone by a private and that undergone by a higher officer. The risk to the life of each is the same, and I think it is a highly logical proposal which the Senator from Illinois has made.

Mr. HUNT. I think the Senator is quite correct. The life of a private is just as dear as is the life of a general. However, generals are in very, very important positions, and the loss of a general from the standpoint of directing the Air Force, is of course, more serious than the loss of a private.

Mr. MOODY. I understand that, but it is not a question of the respective values of the men; it is a question of remunerating them for extra hazard. I

think the hazard to the life of each of the two men is the same. Therefore, I cannot see why one should be paid \$30 and the other should be paid \$200. I am surprised that the matter has not been taken up before this time.

Mr. HUNT. The same situation exists in civilian life as well as in the armed services, or in almost any line of endeavor.

Mr. MOODY. Paying \$200 will not replace a general, any more than paying \$30 will replace a private.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, may I first ask how much time I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five minutes are left.

Mr. HUNT. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I have here some statistics found in the testimony of Admiral Cassady when he appeared before the committee. I should like to ask the Senator if it is his understanding that these figures are correct:

In World War II more than two-thirds of all the Army officers killed in combat were flying officers. The combat death rate per thousand enlisted men was 69 for the Air Corps as compared with 27.7 for Infantry, 14½ for the Navy, 4.9 for Field Artillery, and 1.3 for Coast Artillery.

Is it the understanding of the Senator from Wyoming that these figures indicate that the death rate for flying officers is considerably higher per thousand than for combat officers in other branches of the service?

Mr. HUNT. I am not informed as to the death rate in the various branches of the services, but if my memory serves me correctly, the highest death rate is in the Air Force.

Mr. SMATHERS. For enlisted men the figure I have is that in World War II the death rate was 69 per 1,000 for the Air Force and only 27.7 for the infantry. I wondered if those are the correct figures.

Mr. HUNT. I would think the figures are correct.

I yield to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I believe the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has covered the points involved in this discussion. No one can question the fact that there have been abuses in connection with flight pay. Some men have drawn flying pay who were not entitled to receive it. There have undoubtedly been instances of officers having taken advantage of the incentive pay provision to draw funds which were never contemplated by the Congress.

I hope the Senate will not take this meat-ax approach to the subject. As stated by the Senator from Wyoming, a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services started an investigation some weeks ago. It was in no wise designed to counteract the efforts of the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. I would not say that the discussion last year may not have had an influence on the subject matter.

The question of extra pay for those in the aviation service should be very care-

fully examined and should not be dealt with in this summary fashion. It is quite true that an adequate number of young men are now volunteering for flying service, but there can be little question that the incentive pay which is available has been a considerable element in persuading them to enter that branch of the service.

The subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], should go into the question very carefully. We are all concerned about it. We all wish to effect every possible economy that can be effected and at the same time preserve an adequate defense for the Nation and enable us to avoid a third world war, or if another world war should come, to provide such a defense as will enable us to survive and to maintain our free institutions.

There is much merit in the contention of the Senator from Illinois, and I have a great deal of sympathy with his views in the matter, but I respectfully submit that we should not in this fashion approach it, as it were, with a meat ax and say that because the life of a private is as valuable as that of a general we will cut them off at exactly the same level. The hazard involved is not always the same.

Undoubtedly, the most hazardous task is that of flying the new jet planes. All the "bugs" have not yet been taken out of them. That is true of various types of airplanes. They are always flown by commissioned officers. If we undertake to fix a definite limit on the amount of incentive pay, no man can, without a careful hearing and full investigation, tell what effect it will have on the assembling of an adequate, highly skilled, and highly trained corps of pilots to fly the planes or to undertake other very dangerous missions.

There are many abuses in the system which must and should be corrected, but I think we would make a serious mistake if we were to undertake to deal with them in this fashion, in the absence of hearings and without any knowledge or information as to what the effect would be upon a service which is absolutely vital to our existence as a free people.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished chairman whether the committee has made a study of the question why an increasing number of military personnel is holding or has been granted flying status. Whether they occupy chair positions in the Pentagon or are located in one of the military fields, a check of the records will disclose that men far beyond the limit in age are still retaining flying status at some military post as far removed—

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I regret that my time is so limited that I cannot yield at any greater length.

Mr. THYE. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. RUSSELL. I stated at the outset of my remarks that we favored a very careful and painstaking investigation of the question. Undoubtedly there are a

number of abuses which should be corrected. I was only suggesting that the cure offered might kill the patient, whereas we hoped in the committee to cure the abuses without any damage to the patient, which is the Air Force and which is a very vital branch of our armed services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has 11 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, there is a very simple principal at stake in this amendment. Fundamentally, I am not at the moment questioning the provision for incentive pay. It can be examined by the committee. I am not proposing to abolish it; I am proposing to equalize it so that all members of the flying service and the submarine service will get the same bonus pay which a private now receives. The Committee on Armed Services can then go into the question of whether they should receive any bonus at all. For the moment I am not attacking that. I am merely saying that when they are in danger, the life of an officer is no more precious than the life of an enlisted man.

I am also saying that the Senate, by its vote a few minutes ago, approved this principle for those who are in the greatest danger of all, namely, combat infantrymen and those who are actually under rifle fire or artillery fire. That is the only issue at stake.

We know there are abuses. The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, with his characteristic fairness, stated those abuses.

If we postpone this matter, we will always have the Air Force coming forward and saying it should not be eliminated. The representatives of that force so stated last year when we took up the question of 20-hour qualifying time, in order to reduce the gravy which the chair corps receives. They said it would ruin and wreck the Air Force, and they were successful in postponing action.

I have no criticism of those officers. Very few people like to give up privileges. Any group will hold on to a privilege as long as it can. Yet here are systems of bonus payments aggregating \$270,000,000. With the Government facing a deficit of \$15,000,000,000 in the administrative budget and \$10,000,000,000 in the cash budget, it is time to make some excisions, to eliminate some of the abuses, and cut out some of the diseased tissue. Certainly we would like to give the servicemen involved privileges, but we simply cannot afford to allow the privileges now enjoyed to continue.

Justice is on the side of this amendment. It does not sweep bonuses away; it equalizes them. Therefore, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. Is it not true that if there are particularly hazardous assignments, such as those of test pilots, it would be quite possible to hire civilians and pay them more without the necessity of making the increase applicable

across the board, which would cost the Government \$270,000,000?

I think the point made by the Senator from Illinois that the life of a private and the life of a general, a captain, or a lieutenant are equally precious is one that cannot be denied.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder if the able Senator from Illinois would yield to me for the purpose of making a motion to recommit?

Mr. DOUGLAS. To recommit the bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes. I think there is considerable merit in the fight the Senator from Illinois has been making, but I also think we are dealing with a highly technical problem. I am sure the able Senator from Illinois does not want to do anything that will cause irreparable harm to either our Air Force or our submarine service at a time when no one is sufficiently wise to be able to tell whether they will be called upon to meet some very serious challenges.

Therefore, it seems to me that rather than to take piecemeal action, which would probably result in doing real damage to the services, it would be better to recommit the bill to the Committee on Armed Services with instructions to go into the whole matter raised by the Senator from Illinois, and to report a bill in which the phases referred to by him would have been considered along with the pay feature.

I think there is considerable merit in the action of the Senator in bringing up this question in connection with the pay bill, because we will then find that the armed services are vitally interested in getting the pay bill through, and consequently they may give more consideration to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois than they would if it were a separate piece of legislation. I say this because it seems to me that in this highly technical field we would have a better measure if we recommitted the bill and instructed the committee to go into all phases of the problem.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from California what is to prevent the Senate from debating this amendment and then having the Committee on Armed Services take up these matters and report a supplemental bill? It will not take any more time.

To state the point frankly, we are somewhat concerned that if the bill goes back to committee, the siren and seductive influence of the Air Force and Navy will be very powerful, and such action will, in effect, delay this amendment.

While this issue is on the floor and before the country, I think it would be much better to have a vote upon it.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to point out to the distinguished Senator from California that this question was before the Senate a year ago. At that time it was voted upon. It seems to me there has been ample time in which to hold

hearings. As the Senator from Illinois said no great harm can be done by voting on this question today, and if it is as urgent as the Senator from Illinois says it is, hearings could be held, and then we would be assured of prompt action.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that House bill 5715 be recommitment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is in control of the time. Does he yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, I do not yield for the making of a motion to recommit. I regret to have to say that to my good friend, the Senator from California, I do not yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Would a motion to recommit at this time be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion to recommit is in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to recommit H. R. 5715 to the Committee on Armed Services with instructions to go into the whole matter of extra pay and to report back to the Senate at the earliest possible time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from California include in his motion a request that the Committee on Armed Services consider overseas allowances in addition to other allowances?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In that category I think there can be found probably the greatest waste of all. There are officers abroad living like kings at the expense of the United States Government, in addition to sums which are collected from Germany, Austria, and Japan as occupation costs. If there is a desire to develop good feelings between the United States and other nations, we had better eliminate some of that slush, too.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it is obvious that this bill as it came from the House of Representatives called for the expenditure of \$850,095,800, as shown on page 4 of the committee report. The bill as reported by the Senate committee reduced that amount by \$379,196,536, but it still leaves a bill calling for the expenditure of \$470,899,264. There is almost half a billion dollars involved in the proposed legislation.

We have just adopted a combat-pay amendment which will probably increase the amount proposed by the Senate committee by possibly \$75,000,000, perhaps more. Other amendments are being proposed which may seriously jeopardize our Air Force and submarine service.

However, I think the Senator from Illinois has made a point relative to the

questions here involved to which the American people are entitled to have a full and complete answer.

I think the place for the point to be made by the Senator from Illinois, and those who seek to uphold this extra pay, is before the Committee on Armed Services, and it seems to me that the proper manner of proceeding, and the one that will obtain legislation which is not likely to endanger national defense, is to recommit the bill to the committee with instructions to study all questions which have been raised on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wonder if the Senator from California would accept an amendment to his motion to recommit, in the form of an instruction to the committee that it report back not later than April 15. There is a tremendous interest in this question at this time, as my colleague [Mr. DOUGLAS] has said. I should not like to see the subject buried in the committee. I should like to see the question disposed of on its merits. It seems to me that unless the Armed Services Committee is head over heels in work, the time suggested would be sufficient to enable it to report a suitable bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me say to the Senator from Illinois that I do not want to see this matter buried in committee. I am a member of the Armed Services Committee. I have not had an opportunity to consult with the able chairman of the committee [Mr. RUSSELL]. I believe that April 15 would be too early a date to allow the type of investigation which should be made. However, I believe that a reasonable time would be not later than May 15. That would give assurance that the question would be brought back to the Senate for consideration before the Congress adjourns.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will accept that modification, if the Senator from California is willing to make the date May 15. I believe that those who are interested are entitled to be heard.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I submit my motion to recommit.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to make it perfectly clear that I support the principle enunciated by the Senator from Illinois. At the same time, I think it is reasonable that some further study be given to this subject. I should be willing to support the motion of the Senator from California, provided the time limit were made April 15. I do not believe it is desirable to delay consideration of this subject for another 6 weeks. I should be compelled to vote against the motion of the Senator from California to recommit unless the delay were limited to 2 weeks; in other words, unless the date were made April 15, I should be compelled to vote against the motion.

Mr. RUSSELL rose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, we are dealing with some practical prob-

lems here. I do not know for what purpose the chairman of my committee is rising, but I will say that in my judgment the 15th of April would allow too short a time to give this subject the study to which it is entitled. The original suggestion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] was that the date be made April 15. He has accepted a modification to May 15. I shall certainly do everything I can, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, to expedite the hearings and report the bill back sooner than that, if possible. May 15 would be the deadline, which would give us assurance that the subject would be back before this body in time to act before adjournment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Senator yield so that I may ask the Senator from Georgia a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I ask the Senator from Georgia if he feels that the date of May 1 would give the committee ample time to investigate the proposals which are now pending and to report back. I should not like to see the subject buried.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not believe that May 1 would allow ample time. When we go into the various pay scales we are dealing with one of the most complex subjects that can possibly come before the Congress.

If the Senate wishes to recommit the bill, it should be willing to give the Committee on Armed Services a reasonable time. If the Senate is unwilling to give the Committee on Armed Services a reasonable time, we ought to continue to legislate on the floor and vote the amendments up or down as they come before us, pass a bill, and send it to the House, and see what the result will be.

I have told the Senate that even now, after 2 or 3 weeks of preparation and investigation, the Senate committee is holding hearings on the question of flying pay. I believe the hearings started last Friday—at any rate some time during the past week. They are in progress at the present time. It would be impossible for the Senate Committee on Armed Services to go into all the questions involved by April 15 and make an intelligent report. If it must report by April 15, we shall have the bill back here in just about the shape it is in now. If the Senate were unwilling to give the committee a reasonable time in case the bill should be recommitted, it would be better to proceed now to legislate on the floor of the Senate, as we are doing, and see what kind of bill will evolve.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would the Senator agree to May 15, which would allow 6 weeks?

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe that during that time the committee would have opportunity to investigate all the questions involved.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will leave the date at May 15.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have now made a motion to recommit the bill. I assume that there will be a division of time on the motion. I want to be generous with the time, but I do not want to be in the position where I am cut off from further discussion. There should be some time for those who are opposed to the motion to recommit. How much time have I?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty minutes are allowed to each side.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to know whether or not the motion to recommit takes precedence over the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It does.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield. As I understand, my time begins to run as of now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the pay-raise bill was introduced last October. It received very careful consideration, and was passed by the House. I am averse to delaying consideration of it for as much as 6 weeks, or even 4 weeks. It seems to me that the only question in doubt is the question of the extra flight and submarine pay.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no.

Mr. LEHMAN. We have before us a bill on which we would be ready to vote except for those questions. We have already adopted an amendment providing for additional combat pay. It seems to me that so far as recommitment is concerned, at least the main purpose would be to study the question of additional flight pay and additional pay for submarine service. That is not a new subject. That subject has been before the committee for a long time.

I congratulate the committee and its chairman on the very conscientious and devoted work which has been done. It seems to me that there is involved an important principle, which I am willing to support, but I am not willing to have the bill held up for another 4 weeks or 6 weeks. I believe that the members of the Armed Services are entitled to action within a reasonable time. What I consider a reasonable time is a delay of another 2 weeks.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the fact that the committee thought the pay increase should be settled at the earliest possible date was the reason which prompted us to report the bill in this fashion. Let me say to the Senator from New York the question is much more involved than the question of flying pay. The Senator from Illinois has an amendment which deals with extra compensation for members of the Medical and Dental Corps. He has another

amendment which deals with the question of various perquisites and additional pay for officers and enlisted members serving overseas.

The Senator from California has accepted the suggestion that all those subjects be considered in the hearings. Manifestly it would be impossible for the committee, within a period of 2 weeks, to give fair and just treatment to the many different problems which involve every form of pay of all the personnel of the armed services.

If the bill is recommitted, we would hope to have a bill on the floor of the Senate in less than 6 weeks, dealing with the question of hazard pay or flying pay. The subcommittee is studying that subject at the present time. I think there is little doubt that some legislation will evolve from those hearings, and that it will be on the floor of the Senate before the expiration of a period of 6 weeks.

If the Senate sees fit to do so, it has a perfect right to adopt any amendments it wishes to adopt. I have never complained about the exercise of rights or privileges by any Senator. However, I believe that these subjects should be considered in separate legislation, which we would hope to get to the floor of the Senate in less than 6 weeks. It may not be in the form in which all Senators wish to have it, but there will be an opportunity to offer amendments at that time.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Can the Senator advise us whether or not, if a bill is passed with these various amendments, it will be possible for the conferees to go into the various subjects, seek the best advice, and agree upon a bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. As a practical matter, as the Senator from Louisiana knows, when there is attached to a bill an entirely new provision, which has not been the subject of hearings, it is next to impossible to have it agreed to in conference. I do not know whether or not the House committee has held hearings on these specific subjects. If it has, they will undoubtedly be dealt with in conference. If no hearings have been held by the House committee, the House conferees will probably take the adamant position, "We have held no hearings on that subject, and we refuse absolutely to discuss it in conference."

In my opinion, the amendments to which reference has been made would endanger the pay bill. If Senators wish to use them as a device to prevent passage of the pay bill, they have a perfect right to do so. As I understand, there is considerable opposition to any increase whatever in the pay of members of the armed services. At least four members of the committee reserved the right to oppose the bill on the floor. They have the right to exercise that reservation. I want the Senate to know that the reservation of the right to oppose this bill on the floor was made in committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may I modify my motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California may modify his motion.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, at the suggestion of a number of Senators, who feel that there should not be undue delay, and at the same time are mindful of the point raised by the chairman of the committee, to the effect that April 15 would be too early, I modify my motion to recommit the bill so as to provide that it be reported back to the Senate not later than May 1, instead of May 15.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California modifies his motion accordingly.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not jeopardize the allowances which are provided in the bill for the members of the armed services by recommitting the bill. We all know that when a bill is recommitted, new provisions are placed in it, and it is then passed by the Senate, the conference committee may take a considerable time in reaching a conclusion. I believe that the evidence before the committee showed that some of the officers and enlisted personnel involved, particularly those in the lower echelons, are barely eking out an existence under the present allowances. They need the little extra money which this bill would provide. I had hoped that the bill would become effective at an earlier date.

Mr. President, to recommit the bill would mean jeopardizing the allowances which are proposed for the members of the military forces. Let us take up these questions which have been raised and dispose of them in an orderly way instead of jeopardizing the pay of the men and women who are making a sacrifice for the country. We have already given pay increases to civilian employees of the Government, but we have delayed giving pay increases to officers and enlisted personnel of the armed services. I understand that the report of the committee on this bill was unanimous.

I hope the Senate will not recommit the bill, and thus jeopardize the small pay increases which it provides for those who are serving their country.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the report of the committee was unanimous, but, as I stated when I presented the bill, at least four members of the committee reserved the right to vote against any pay increases whatever. They permitted the bill to be reported to the Senate, and they favored it as compared with the House bill, but they reserved the right on the floor of the Senate to oppose any increase in compensation whatever.

There can be no question about the correctness of the statement made by the distinguished majority leader, that if we use this bill as a vehicle for dealing with every subject under the sun that has to do with compensation in the armed services we will jeopardize the increases provided in the pending bill.

In explaining the bill I undertook to point out to the Senate that we did not favor a 10 percent flat increase, but that we had increased some of the allowances which have a direct relation to actual

cost-of-living items—involving things members of the armed services must buy and the shelter they must provide for themselves and their families—by as much as 30 percent in some instances at the same time reducing the over-all pay increase to 3 percent.

It is impossible to properly legislate in the fashion now being undertaken. We cannot tie a conglomeration of subjects together without endangering the entire bill. Any Senator who has served on the Armed Services Committee and has been in conference with the House on bills of this type cannot fail to be aware of the attitude of the Members of the other body when the Senate incorporates in such a bill subjects which have not been explored in the hearings before committees of the other House. We would jeopardize the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Has he concluded his remarks?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I have not concluded my remarks.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator yield for an explanatory statement?

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I desire to make it perfectly clear that certainly I and I do not believe that any other Senator who is sponsoring these amendments wishes to delay or impede for even so much as 1 day the granting of an increase in basic pay and allowances. Quite to the contrary, we want to speed up the procedure. That is one of the reasons why I intend to vote against the motion to recommit the bill, because it would delay the process of granting pay increases to our military personnel.

What we are trying to do while this question is before the Senate is to remedy injustices which consist on the one hand, of denying bonuses to those who are actually in danger, and, on the other hand, granting excessively large bonuses to those who are not in any appreciable danger. At the same time we would save approximately from \$175,000,000 to \$200,000,000 a year. I think it is perfectly appropriate action to take on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course I did not charge that the Senator from Illinois is trying to delay the granting of an increase in pay to our armed personnel.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wanted to make my position perfectly clear.

Mr. RUSSELL. However, that is the natural and logical consequence of appending a variety of amendments to a bill while it is under discussion on the floor of the Senate. It would provoke a conference on a long list of amendments, and the conferences would last longer than if the committee were to hold hearings until May 15. If the bill is to be sent back to the committee, the committee should be given ample time in which to investigate all the facts.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it the opinion of the chairman of the committee that the subcommittee which he has assigned to

examine into the question of hazard pay can report its findings to the Senate by May 1 or May 15?

Mr. RUSSELL. The distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the able chairman of the subcommittee, is on the floor of the Senate, and he can speak for himself. However, it is my opinion that the subcommittee will undoubtedly have concluded its hearings into that subject prior to that time, and that proposed legislation will have been evolved from those hearings and will be on the floor of the Senate prior to May 15.

In my opinion by proceeding in that manner final legislation could be enacted at a much earlier date than if we were to legislate in fashion here proposed. Of course, I understand it is very attractive to vote for these amendments, when everyone knows that some action should be taken, although no one is quite sure just what the action should be. In order to get the job done properly we should follow the policy of allowing our committees to deal with these subjects one by one and thus getting them ironed out properly.

I hope that the Senate will not recommit the bill. It is my opinion that the Senate should face these issues squarely and courageously and vote down the motion to recommit the bill, and vote down the amendments. We should permit the subcommittee to conclude its work and bring its bill to the Senate. Then the Senator from Illinois and other Senators will have adequate opportunity to offer amendments if the bill as reported is not in accord with their desires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit, as modified, offered by the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hendrickson	Moody
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bricker	Hill	Murray
Bridges	Holland	Neely
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Nixon
Byrd	Hunt	O'Connor
Cain	Ives	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cordon	Knowland	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Langer	Seaton
Douglas	Lehman	Smathers
Dworshak	Lodge	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Long	Smith, N. J.
Ecton	Magnuson	Sparkman
Ellender	Malone	Stennis
Ferguson	Martin	Thye
Flanders	Maybank	Tobey
Frear	McCarran	Underwood
Fulbright	McCarthy	Watkins
George	McFarland	Welker
Gillette	McKellar	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Williams
Hayden	Monroney	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Presiding Officer be so kind as to have the pending motion stated again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California [Mr. KNOW-

LAND] has moved that House bill 5715 be recommitted with instructions to report back to the Senate on or before May 1.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Were there not included in the motion to recommit instructions as to the variety of subjects to be covered by the committee in its investigation and inquiries?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The instructions as the Chair understood the motion of the Senator from California, were to study the hazard-pay features of the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Were other instructions included in the motion?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No, to study the hazard-pay issues which have been raised.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I understood that the Senator from California agreed that the subject of overseas allowances and the questions of doctors' allowances would also be included.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct; I think I also added the words "and the other issues that have been raised on the floor."

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the question of agreeing to the motion to recommit, with instructions, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY and Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent because of illness.

I announce further that if present and voting the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] would vote "nay."

Mr. BRIDGES. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Oregon

[Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] is absent by leave of the Senate.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] from the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—31

Bennett	Ferguson	Schoeppel
Bricker	Flanders	Seaton
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Smith, Maine
Butler, Md.	Hunt	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Knowland	Thye
Cain	Martin	Welker
Cordon	McCarthy	Wiley
Dirksen	Millikin	Williams
Dworshak	Nixon	Young
Eastland	O'Mahoney	
Ecton	Robertson	

NAYS—44

Anderson	Humphrey	Monroney
Capehart	Ives	Moody
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Mundt
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Ellender	Langer	O'Connor
Frear	Lehman	Pastore
Fulbright	Lodge	Russell
George	Long	Smathers
Gillette	Magnuson	Sparkman
Green	Malone	Stennis
Hayden	Maybank	Tobey
Hendrickson	McCarran	Underwood
Hill	McFarland	Watkins
Holland	McKellar	

NOT VOTING—21

Aiken	Duff	Kilgore
Benton	Henning	McClellan
Brewster	Hoey	McMahon
Butler, Nebr.	Jenner	Morse
Carlson	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Case	Kerr	Smith, N. C.
Clements		Taft

So Mr. KNOWLAND's motion to recommit, with instructions, was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask how much time remains to the proponents, and how much to the opponents of the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proponent of the amendment has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And the opponents?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All the time of the opponents has been consumed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the amendment which is now before the Senate would at once give justice and at the same time save \$142,000,000. What it does is to provide that there shall be equalization of the bonuses in the Air Force and in the submarine services, but that all shall receive the same pay as a private, on the principle that there is no distinction between the life and the danger suffered by officers and men.

The amendment is in complete accord with the principle which the Senate just adopted in the case of combat troops. That is a very fine amendment, and it likewise draws no distinction. My amendment will provide the funds needed for the extra money which has been voted to those engaged in combat duty,

and it will save more than \$50,000,000 to the taxpayers.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. Is it not true that the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, which would save the money needed to provide extra combat pay, could be adjusted, if any inequities were found in it later, through the hearings to which the distinguished chairman of the committee has referred?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, certainly, and furthermore, it would diminish the appetite of the Air Corps to go into the air and earn—not earn, but receive—from \$100 to \$210 a month. Under the amendment they would be paid \$3.60 an hour for overtime; which is good pay.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me 1 minute?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, indeed; I am very glad to yield 1 minute to the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I shall support this amendment. I realize that hearings on the amendment cannot be held immediately, but the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee is already conducting hearings on this matter, and even if the amendment cannot be agreed to in conference, I believe that some legislation along this line should be adopted. Therefore I support this amendment, hoping that the conferees may get better advice on this subject, and that meanwhile the Armed Services Committee may be able to work out a pay recommendation for service of this kind.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee has not had adequate time to discuss this question, I yield whatever time may remain to the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I merely wish to tell the Senate again that this question is now under exhaustive inquiry by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services. It involves many ramifications. The Senator's statement as to the danger varying in degree and as to the value of life being the same in the case of a private and the case of a general is of course true. But the hazards which accrue by virtue of various services rendered by the Air Force are vastly different. In other words, a pilot, a first lieutenant, flying a jet plane on an experimental flight is incurring much more danger to his life than is a private having the position of steward on the flight of a military air transport plane.

Another question that is involved is the question of how to solve honorably the problem of the various contracts entered into by these men with the Government, when they went into the service of the Government with the assurance that they would receive this pay. That question is also involved. Here, without any hearing, it is proposed to take snap action, when it is not known what con-

sequences will ensue, although it is known that it violates thousands of contracts which the Government has made with its citizens, and does so without any exhaustive studies such as the committee is now endeavoring to make.

If it were desired to delay this pay bill, carrying as it does allowances for those who have a large number of dependents, a very fine opportunity is presented to delay it, merely by voting this amendment into the bill. It would be delayed in conference with the House perhaps for several weeks. We are dealing with the subject matter of the amendment separately, and we hope to be able to submit to the Senate a bill which will give the Senator from Illinois and all other Senators who feel as he does an opportunity to amend the law which provides for flight pay or to wipe it out entirely, but that should not be done in this bill, when the committee now has the question under investigation.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Does not the amendment of the Senator from Illinois cover both combat flying and flight training?

Mr. RUSSELL. It makes no distinction as to the varying degrees of danger or anything else. It merely prescribes a rigid principle. A question so important should not be dealt with in a meat-ax fashion, without hearings. Hearings are now in progress. Correction of the situation of which the Senator from Illinois complains will be expedited, and Senators who desire it will get an increased allowance for dependents much quicker by dealing with the issues separately.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois for yielding me this time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I know the Senator desires to have a correct statement made. Under the Long-Moody amendment which the Senate has just adopted, all members of the Armed Forces, including aviators, engaging in combat would be paid \$45 a month.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thought the amendment failed to cover aviators. The amendment, unless changed by the Senator from Michigan, did not deal with the Air Force, because, under the amendment as originally drafted, they drew no combat pay. I do not know what shape it is in now, but the amendment as drafted had no application to such pay.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I believe the Senator will find that the amendment which was drawn does apply to those in the Air Force, but it is provided that if they are receiving compensation above the \$50 or the \$45, as the case might be, they cannot draw more than one incentive pay.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. They would not draw that in addition to receiving other pay.

Mr. LONG. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to point out that that clears up the point. I think the Air Force, when

not in combat, under my amendment would receive \$30 a month; and when in combat, under the Long-Moody amendment, they would receive \$45.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. I did not understand the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent because of illness.

Mr. BRIDGES. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—32

Anderson	Gillette	Nixon
Bennett	Hickenlooper	O'Connor
Bridges	Humphrey	Seaton
Capehart	Lehman	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Long	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Malone	Thye
Douglas	Martin	Watkins
Eastland	Moody	Welker
Ellender	Mundt	Wiley
Ferguson	Murray	Williams
Frear	Neely	

NAYS—43

Bricker	Hoey	McKellar
Butler, Md.	Holland	Millikin
Byrd	Hunt	Monroney
Cain	Ives	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Dirksen	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Dworshak	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Ecton	Knowland	Schoeppel
Flanders	Langer	Smathers
Fulbright	Lodge	Sparkman
George	Magnuson	Stennis
Green	Maybank	Underwood
Hayden	McCarran	Young
Hendrickson	McCarthy	
Hill	McFarland	

NOT VOTING—21

Aiken	Duff	McClellan
Benton	Hennings	McMahon
Brewster	Jenner	Morse
Butler, Nebr.	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Carlson	Kem	Smith, N. C.
Case	Kerr	Taft
Clements	Kilgore	Tobey

So Mr. DOUGLAS' amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, immediately following line 24, insert the following new section:

Section 3, subsection (e) of section 204 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 is hereby amended by adding the following after the period:

"Flight personnel whose assigned duties do not involve actual combat missions or flight in excess of 20 hours per month."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senate has just defeated an amendment which would have saved \$142,000,000. The amendment now before the Senate is similar to an amendment which was adopted by the Senate last fall to the military appropriations bill. It tries to strike at the abuse of administrative officers being taken up into the air 4 hours a month, or 100 hours during the year, and receiving a flight bonus of from \$100 to \$210 a month. The amendment in question requires them to spend at least 20 hours a month in the air. It is hoped, therefore, that they will be allowed to go into the air only if they are on an actual training mission and that they will not indulge in week-end sky excursions at the expense of the taxpayers.

The Senate once adopted a provision similar to this amendment. I believe there is a chance to save perhaps a similar amount of money as would have been saved by the previous amendment. My estimate is that \$25,000,000 in pay and \$25,000,000 in gasoline will be saved, and I have made a rough estimate that \$50,000,000 in wear and tear on airplanes will be saved.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Can the Senator assure us that his amendment will not simply have the effect that those who might have 4 or 5 hours a week training will now have about 20 hours, which will probably cost more than he proposes to save?

Mr. DOUGLAS. On Friday I said, in connection with this very question, that this would be a very grave charge against the Air Force, if true. I do not believe it is true. I do not believe we will find supervising personnel with the gall to give permission to administrative officers to fly 20 hours a month as copilots. I think they will not do that. I have sufficient faith in their patriotism and good sense as supervisory authorities to believe that they will not do such a thing, and I reject the argument which the proponents of the Air Force used against this amendment last year.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I must take exception to the statement that the flying done is week-end excursion flying, and to the inference that these men fly only 4 hours a month.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The minimum is 4 hours a month, with a yearly minimum of 100 hours. That is an average of 8½ hours a month.

Mr. MONRONEY. They must fly 10 hours a month in order to make 100 hours a year. I do not believe the Senator wishes to leave with the Senate the impression that this is week-end flying, because he surely knows that in order to maintain flight status and earn flight pay, officers do not go on week-end excursions. They must fly through adverse weather. That does not mean flying in fair weather; it means actual instrument flying, in conditions under which they must fly red-hot planes. They do not have bonanzas, or easy civilian planes to fly. After they leave their desks, the planes they must take up in order to maintain their flying status are fast, hot military planes. Not only must they fly during that time on instruments through bad weather, but half the time it must be night flying. I do not believe any man will say it is a pleasant excursion or much fun to build up 100 hours a year by buzzing around through the skies in hot airplanes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is my understanding that the duty of pilots can be discharged by their being copilots for a large percentage of the required time.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is not my understanding from talking with pilots in the Air Force.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will yield, I should like to hear the answer to the question the Senator from Oklahoma asked the Senator from Illinois. We could not hear on this side of the aisle. It seems to me that the Senator from Oklahoma raised a very important question, and I should like to hear the answer to it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is my understanding that a large part of the duty of being a pilot can be discharged by acting as a copilot. I may say I have seen payrolls—but I will not say how they were furnished to me—in which there were mess officers, and others, who at the end of a month proceeded to fly for 4 hours to a certain place, and flew back for 4 hours the first day of the following month, thus meeting the requirements for 2 months, as specified.

I should like to point out from an article in the Evening Star, whose author appears to be well informed and, I think, fairly accurate, that approximately 1,800 Air Corps officers of the "chair corps" fly weekends and off days, and therefore qualify for extra pay.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Obviously, perhaps there are some defects; there may be some ways in which very few high-ranking officers might be able to ride as

copilots without actually flying the planes. But I think the chairman of the committee brought out the very point at issue, that the problem of trying to eliminate waste, while at the same time preserving necessary hazard pay for men flying jet planes and other hot military airships, can best be solved by subsequent legislation, such as he proposes to report by May 1.

Mr. RUSSELL. May 15.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is the way to approach the problem complained of by the Senator from Illinois in his great efforts to save money. However, if in trying to save a few dollars in flight pay—

Mr. DOUGLAS. A hundred million dollars a year.

Mr. MONRONEY. If we should lose some B-36 or B-29 bombers in Japan, we shall have been penny wise and pound foolish, because the very men who today might be chairborne in the Pentagon, tomorrow might be sending a son of the Senator or other boys out to fly in Korea. I want a flying air force officer to be a man who can command other men and tell them where and when to fly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The purpose of the Senator from Oklahoma is the purpose of the Senator from Illinois. I, too, want an Air Force that flies. In particular, I want the pay to go to actual aviators, not to obsolescent aviators, those who because of girth or age have been retired to desks. That is just the point.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has control of the time.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. If, as the Senator from Illinois suggests, the regulations are being used to permit week-end excursions and the like, I should like to know if the results desired could not be obtained by simply an order from the head of the Air Force.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The basic law provides that the bonuses can be obtained if a man flies 4 hours a month or a total of 100 hours a year, or an average of 8½ hours a month. The regulations prescribe the type and height of flying, but the amount of flying is prescribed by legislation. What the pending amendment tries to provide is that if officers receive the amount of pay indicated, they should give at least 20 hours a month in the air. That would mean they would get two and one-half times the amount of training they now receive, if the purpose is to promote efficiency. This amendment provides that they shall give value for the money received. Their responsibilities will not be discharged merely by 4 or 8 hours a month in the air, but they will have to fly 20 hours, so the amount of training will be two and one-half times that which is now received. Those flying merely to get flight pay would be squeezed out by that requirement.

Mr. MALONE. If the regulations are clear—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be necessary for the Senator from Nevada to have a Senator in control of the time yield to him.

Mr. RUSSELL. I merely wish to repeat substantially what I said a few minutes ago. There is not a Member of the Senate who has not had his attention called to some officer drawing flight pay but who has not altogether been entitled to draw such pay. All of us are indignant, and properly so, when we hear of an officer who is drawing flight pay when, as a matter of fact, his duties do not require him to be a pilot or entitle him to draw such pay. I wish to say that for every one of those men, there are three or four men who are receiving intensive training, and who may be in some way affected by the application of this amendment.

A subcommittee headed by the Senator from Texas is carefully going into every phase of this matter. I think we are all aware of what that subcommittee has done in the past, and I know that they will go into the question of flight pay and its administration in a careful manner and make adjustments on the basis of the hearings they will hold.

I wish to point out to the Senator from Illinois that this very amendment was offered a year ago, and it was rejected by the House. The House would not consider it in conference. The Senator has introduced no bill on the subject.

The Armed Services Committee is going into that subject now. I believe the Senate can depend on having a bill before it which will be based on facts, rather than being based on indignation against two or three officers who might have abused the provisions of the present law. I do not think we ought to legislate in this shotgun fashion. It is not necessary to do so to correct an evil. It is much better to allow the evil, affecting a few officers, to continue for 6 weeks than to complicate this bill with such an amendment, and also to jeopardize the accomplishment of a thorough job by way of legislation.

I hope the Senate will reject the pending amendment.

Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] requested some time. I yield him 2 minutes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I asked for time before I heard the Senator from Georgia speak. He had said everything I intended to say, and I think he has said it much better than I could have said it, so I will not need the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It is my amendment designated "3-28-52-D."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, after line 24, it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. All overseas station per diem allowances for members of the armed services on duty outside the continental United States or in Alaska, as set forth in the Joint Travel Regulations, appendix B, are hereby reduced 50 percent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senate voted down one amendment which would have saved \$140,000,000, and it voted down another amendment which would have saved \$100,000,000. There were two other amendments affecting bonus pay which I had intended to offer, one relating to bonus pay for parachute, glider, and other such duty, which would have saved three and one-third million dollars, and one relating to extra bonus pay for doctors, which would have saved \$25,000,000. However, in view of the treatment which has been accorded to the other amendments, I do not propose to offer them, but I hope the committee will consider those subjects. I am offering the pending amendment, reducing overseas allowances by 50 percent, and I should like to speak very briefly on that point.

In addition to the basic pay which officers and men receive, and in addition to the quarters and subsistence allowances which they receive if they are stationed overseas, they also are given what is called an overseas allowance. I placed certain figures in the RECORD on Friday, and I ask Senators, if they are interested, to turn to page 3113 of the RECORD where they will see the scale on a per diem basis.

Very briefly, these additional amounts come to between \$2,000 and \$2,500 a year, over and above the basic pay, and above quarters and subsistence allowances. The result is that a colonel on duty in London receives a total of \$12,786, or about \$13,000. Moreover, this is added to in the occupied countries by allowances for servants, and other items which are charged not against the United States Government, but against the occupation costs in Germany, Austria, and Japan.

The result is that a very large proportion of our officers and the first three grades in the enlisted groups are living abroad on an extremely lavish scale. Everyone who has been abroad knows that to be so. Everyone who has friends who have gone abroad knows it to be so. That has the dual result of wasting a tremendous amount of money and breeding an enormous amount of ill will against us in those countries. I pointed out, for example, that a colonel who was a military attaché in London, and who received \$12,786, could draw, in addition, a military attaché's allotment of \$3,720 more, giving him a total of \$16,500.

I also pointed out that according to the British income-tax statistics there are only 16 people in the British Isles who have a net income of more than \$16,000 after taxes.

The result of all this is that America is being identified abroad not as a country of virile democracy, but as a country living off Europe, whose soldiers stationed abroad are living on the scale of the Waldorf-Astoria. That is not the impression we want to give to the world. It hurts our international relations, and it is provocative of great waste.

My amendment would cut these allowances in half. It would provide that the military personnel involved could receive an extra sum of between \$1,000 and \$1,250 a year, over and above base pay, over and above quarters and subsistence allowances, and over and above any sums provided by the countries which are being occupied. The amendment would save a great deal of money. It would save incalculable amounts of money, and also it would remove a provocative source of international opposition. The sums presently paid, I may say, are set not by Congress, but by administrative regulations. This is another example of the Armed Forces being extremely lavish with themselves at the expense of the taxpayers.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the statement of the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I listened with interest when he discussed this subject last week. I was somewhat surprised—nay, startled—by some of the figures which he gave the Senate. Over the week end I have had occasion to look into this subject to some extent. There may be instances of officers drawing more than they are entitled to draw. The Senator from Illinois has properly and correctly stated that it is done under regulations, rather than by law. However, the amounts involved are not quite so large as I was led to believe by the Senator's statement.

There are a number of printed schedules dealing with this subject. The per diem allowance in London to which the Senator has referred is not excessive. It is \$2.75 a day. So the comparison with the net income of \$16,000 which the Senator says is the maximum drawn by only 16 Britishers, is not applicable.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The \$3.75—

Mr. RUSSELL. It is \$2.75.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Appendix B of the Joint Travel Regulations, which I have before me, fixes a \$3.75 subsistence allowance for London, plus \$3 for quarters, making a total of \$6.75 a day, which comes to about \$2,350 a year.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was about to point out that the Senator's amendment relates to Joint Travel Regulations, Appendix B. Appendix B is no longer in effect. That has long since passed on. These regulations are redrawn every month; so the Senator's amendment is not tied in with any existing regulation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Under which shell is the pea now? It seems that whenever one tries to reduce the privileges of members of the Armed Forces, that group moves the pea under a new shell. However, in this shell game with the armed services, I am willing to modify my amendment so as to get at the right pea.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sorry that I have not been able to get into this "shell game" with any degree of success. The first I heard of these matters was when the Senator raised them on Friday of last week.

The total amount involved, which has been drawn under all travel or per diem allowances, is \$42,452,000. That is a very substantial sum of money. However, I wish to point out that \$30,418,000 of that money goes to the enlisted men.

Therefore, the officers, all told—and this includes travel and per diem—drew only \$12,000,000. Of course, that may be an excessive amount. Mr. President, it is very difficult indeed to deal with any organization so far flung as our Military Establishment without there being some waste and some abuse. I hope and believe that the subcommittee headed by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], which is now investigating these subjects, will go fully into them and bring before the Senate legislative provisions which will have some validity.

The pending amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois relates to regulations which are no longer in effect and which were discarded some months ago.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Georgia, with his characteristic sense of fairness, would be willing to modify my amendment so that it will refer to the particular regulations which are now in effect. As chairman of the Armed Services Committee, he has access to that kind of information, and I have never been able to get it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hand to the Senator from Illinois the material which was furnished to me approximately 30 seconds ago by the staff that has been dealing with the subject.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This material has suddenly sprung from the bowels of the earth. I must find my way through a maze of Army regulations.

Mr. RUSSELL. If anything has sprung from the bowels of the earth, it is the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois. I did not bring this subject before the Senate. I am glad that the Senator from Illinois has raised it, because it pin points the problem and makes it a proper subject for investigation. I would be happy if the Senator would introduce a bill on the subject and thus give all of us an opportunity to look into it. In that way we could have the subject investigated and could determine the proper course of action to take.

I do not believe the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois, even if adopted in the form proposed, would wreck our Military Establishment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Did the Senator say it would or would not wreck our Military Establishment?

Mr. RUSSELL. I said it would not.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was confused by what seemed to be almost the equivalent of a double negative.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am not in a class with the Senator from Illinois as a grammarian. The thought I intended to convey was that I did not believe it would work any irreparable damage to the armed services of the United States if the Senate were to adopt the amendment. However, I think it is a very poor way to legislate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It would save a lot of money.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I do not believe that it could save a great amount of money. It might work some hardship on enlisted men. I do not know as to that. Of course, the Senator from Illinois is correct in saying that our army of occupation has lived in very splendid quarters. Such practice on the part of conquerors has been the unbroken rule throughout history. However, we are now changing our status in Germany. We are coming more and more to be an associate of Germany rather than an occupier of the country. I assume the conditions which have prevailed will soon change. Undoubtedly the subject should be inquired into. But how can any Member of the Senate, including the distinguished Senator from Illinois, know exactly what would be the consequences of a vote in favor of this amendment? I suggest that the subcommittee go ahead with the work on which it has embarked. The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] will report a bill. If it does not rectify the instances that the Senator from Illinois has in mind, the Senator from Illinois may submit an amendment on the floor of the Senate to correct the situation. I hope the Senator will be kind enough to go before the subcommittee and make a statement which will give the members of the subcommittee information which will be helpful to them in framing proper legislation along the line the Senator has in mind and along which we should legislate, beginning in committee and then coming to the floor of the Senate, instead of beginning on the floor of the Senate and then requiring the Senate to send the bill back to the committee.

Obviously the matter can and will be corrected in due season. I hope the Senate will not adopt the amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have now figured out the Defense Department memoranda governing overseas allowances which are now in effect. Therefore I move to amend my amendment on line 4 by striking out Appendix B and substituting therefor Instruction memoranda 2-5, 2-6, and 2-7.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The Senator may modify his amendment without consent of the Senate. Does the Senator wish to modify his amendment accordingly?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois modifies his amendment accordingly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reasons can always be found for not economizing, for deferring, and for postponing. In the meantime the Government of the United States goes into greater and

greater debt. Our deficit next year will be \$15,000,000,000. While the very financial solvency of our country is being threatened, we go on like Rip Van Winkle, who would take a drink and say, "We won't count it this time." We can save \$10,000,000,000, the amount of the estimated cash deficit, only by taking action on specific measures, cutting out abuses here and cutting out abuses there.

Of course the armed services will fight this attempt at economy. They are having a very good time of it. As the saying goes, "They never had it so good." However it is costing money.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hendrickson	Monroney
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Moody
Bricker	Hill	Mundt
Bridges	Hoey	Murray
Butler, Md.	Holland	Neely
Byrd	Humphrey	Nixon
Cain	Hunt	O'Connor
Capehart	Ives	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Dirksen	Knowland	Schoeppel
Douglas	Langer	Seaton
Dworshak	Lehman	Smathers
Eastland	Lodge	Smith, Maine
Eaton	Long	Smith, N. J.
Ellender	Magnuson	Sparkman
Ferguson	Malone	Stennis
Flanders	Martin	Thye
Frear	Maybank	Underwood
Fulbright	McCarran	Watkins
George	McCarthy	Welker
Gillette	McFarland	Wiley
Green	McKellar	Williams
Hayden	Millikin	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], as modified.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on this question I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I call up my amendment. It has been read. I wish to speak on it now. The amendment is a short one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Arkansas has asked some questions about the effect of the amendment. It will affect 480 employees—commissioned officers, warrant officers, or enlisted personnel. The amendment covers certain enlisted personnel, employees of the United States Maritime Service, Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, who are to receive the same benefits of an increase in basic pay which members of the other uniformed services have.

The cost of the amendment will amount to \$121,000 a year additional, to cover the increases.

Under the statutes, the officers of the Maritime Service receive the same pay as that received by the Coast Guard. In the bill, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service are already provided for. This amendment extends the increase in pay to the maritime employees.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my entire statement on this amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

1. Will affect 480 employees—commissioned officers, warrant officers, or enlisted persons of any rank or grade.

2. Cost \$121,000 per year additional, to cover increases.

3. Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic, Public Health, and Armed Services provided for in the bill.

The amendment would include certain (enlisted personnel) employees of the United States Maritime Service, Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, to receive the benefits of an increase in basic pay the same as the other uniformed services.

Section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U. S. C. 1126), authorized the establishment of the United States Maritime Service and authorized the Maritime Commission, now succeeded by the Maritime Administration, to fix the rates of pay of persons enrolled in the service and to assimilate the ranks, grades, and ratings for this personnel with those "as are now or shall hereafter be prescribed" for the personnel of the Coast Guard. Section 509 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 expressly covers the assimilation of pay and allowances of commissioned officers not in the uniformed services to those of officers in the uniformed services, but does not cover the enlisted personnel.

Enrollees of the United States Maritime Service on active administrative duty have, by administrative action of the former Maritime Commission, pursuant to the statute creating the maritime service, received the pay and allowances in their respective ranks, grades, and ratings, as have been provided for personnel of the Coast Guard with similar ranks, grades, and ratings. After the enactment of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, because of difficulty in securing the necessary appropriation, the increases provided by that act, effective October 1, 1949, could not be made on that date, and the increases were not made until January 1, 1950, so far as the enrollees of the maritime service on active administrative duty were concerned, since in this case regulations were not accorded retrospective effect. The applicable appropriation acts for fiscal 1951 (Public Law 759, 81st Cong.) and fiscal 1952 (Public Law 137, 82d Cong.) expressly provide the funds for pay and allowances comparable to those of the Coast Guard as authorized by law.

Section 509 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 provides as follows:

"Sec. 509. The provisions of titles II and III of this act shall apply equally to those persons serving not as commissioned officers in any of the uniformed services, but whose pay or allowances, or both, under existing law are assimilated to the pay and allowances of a commissioned officer of any grade or rank of any of the uniformed services.

In order to avoid the recurrence of any questions of points of order being raised to appropriation provisions to carry out the increases in the pending bill, when enacted, as applicable to the employees in ques-

tion, it is recommended that section 509 be amended by inserting a new section in the pending bill now before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended, in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, to the committee amendment I send to the desk an amendment which I offer and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 6, between lines 3 and 4, after the colon, it is proposed to strike out the table, and to insert the following table:

	1 dependent	2 dependents	Over 2 dependents
E-7-----	\$67.50	\$67.50	\$67.50 plus \$30 for each dependent in excess of 2.
E-6-----	67.50	67.50	Do.
E-5-----	67.50	75.00	\$75 plus \$30 for each dependent in excess of 2.
E-4-----	67.50	75.00	Do.
E-3-----	55.00	95.00	\$95 plus \$30 for each dependent in excess of 2.
E-2-----	55.00	95.00	Do.
E-1-----	55.00	95.00	Do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall not take 20 minutes on this matter.

I wish to describe the amendment, inasmuch as it refers to the table appearing on page 6 of the committee amendment.

The part of the committee amendment to which my amendment relates is the one prescribing the allowances for dependents. As probably all Members of the Senate will recall, at the time when we debated the Dependents' Assistance Act of 1950, there was considerable discussion regarding how much allowance should be made to the families of servicemen, in particular families having more than two dependents. At that time the allotments provided for dependents were increased only up to the point of two dependents. In other words, the Dependents' Assistance Act of 1950 provided maximum benefits for the families of servicemen having only one or two dependents, and then provided a fixed amount for all such families having more than two dependents.

Mr. President, it seems to me that if a man is called into the service and has three or four children, he should be given some additional compensation for the care of his family.

Furthermore, the cost of living has sharply increased since the time when the Dependents' Assistance Act of 1950 went into effect. The full impact of inflation has occurred since that time, and we have not taken adequate recognition of what really has happened.

For example, according to the reports on the measure now before the Senate,

for enlisted members on grades E-1 to E-3, with one dependent, the increase was \$6 a month—in other words, from \$45 to \$51. For two dependents the increase was \$12.50 a month, or up to \$80; for more than 2 dependents, the increase was \$15 a month, or up to \$100.

Mr. President, my position is based upon a set of facts, namely, that the necessary allowances for rent, food, clothing, heat, fuel, and all the other items necessary for living must be increased because the cost of those items has sharply advanced since the time when that act was placed on the statute books. Therefore, Mr. President, the table included in my amendment would adjust assistance allotments based on the rise in the cost of living.

We have just given the civil servants of the Government increased pay, based on a recognition of the increase in the cost of living. Under the wage stabilization program, we have recognized the escalator clause in connection with the contractual relationships between employers and employees, based on the cost of living. We have provided a minimum increase of 10 percent, without any administrative action on the part of the Wage Stabilization Board.

I am simply stating that in the case of men who are called into the armed services, either by the Selective Service System or by means of enlistment, their families should be adequately provided for by allotments to the families and by deductions from the servicemen's income.

Let me present some figures and facts in connection with this matter: Under the present law, a serviceman receiving \$80 a month gives, out of his pay check, \$40; and \$45 is added by the Government as an additional allotment, if there is one dependent. Another \$22 is added if there are two dependents; another \$35 is added if there are more than two dependents.

I am suggesting that these allotment rates be increased up to \$55 for one dependent, up to \$95 for two dependents, and up to \$125 for three dependents; in other words, an additional \$30 for each additional dependent above two. I should like to remind the chairman of this committee, who has done an excellent job in his work upon this very controversial and highly complex pay bill, that all that has been suggested and all that has been proposed by the Senator from Minnesota is adjusted assistance allotments based upon the Consumers Price Index.

Mr. President, on June 4, 1951, I introduced a bill on this very subject. That bill was documented by a statement which I presented at that time and had printed in the RECORD. I also included at the time of the introduction of the bill a number of letters from social agencies throughout the country—social agencies which have been investigating cases of hardship in the families of servicemen. I also included for the purposes of background a discussion of Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates having to do with the annual living costs of a worker's family in certain cities throughout the

United States. I included the compilation of the Consumers Price Index. I repeat that anyone who will look at the record as it was presented, not on the basis of conjecture, but on the basis of statistical analysis, on the basis of the percentage increase in the cost of living will find that the table which the Senator from Minnesota has placed as an amendment before this body is a proposal which merely gives adequate recognition to what has happened in the items which go to make up a typical family budget.

Now to give a case or two in point, some of the cases which were brought to my attention from my own State, for example, by the Hennepin County Council of Social Agencies, an organization which carries on social work in a population group of more than 1,000,000 people. That council of social agencies cited case after case and gave personal documentation of the family budgets and the hardships which were being caused by the lack of adequate family budgets. They pointed out the need for an immediate rise in the allotments granted to the families of servicemen.

My amendment, then, Mr. President, would work as follows: In the lowest classification, that of private, who has a base pay of \$80 a month, there would be taken from his base pay, under the amendment which I propose, \$40, to be applied to the care of his family; added to that would be \$55 for one dependent; and added to that would be \$30 for each additional dependent, depending upon how many members there were in the family.

In the case of a man who has a base pay of \$82.50, there would be taken from it for his family \$40, and added to it would be \$30 across the board for each additional dependent. I ask, Mr. President, who is there in this country who can get by with \$30 a month for each additional dependent? There may be some who have forgotten how much it costs to bring up a 4-year-old or a 3-year-old or a 2-year old son, but I have not; and I know that it is impossible to get by on an additional \$30 a month.

When the young man is overseas or in a camp and has left his family behind and the mother or wife has two or three little children, she cannot possibly afford to go out to work, because if she does she must hire a maid. Of course, if she could make herself into a corporation, she could deduct that as a business expense; but as a wife and as a mother, there is no way by which she can deduct for purposes of taxation any expenditure which might be paid for a maid.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to point out that these allowances are all tax-exempt.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I know.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no tax liability whatever upon these allowances.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I know they are tax free. I was only using this to find a characteristic example of what would

happen in an average man's family. If the wife employs a maid or someone to help do the dishes or clean the house, there is nothing that can be deducted. However, I submit that the maximum which she would be able to get for her family under the pending bill, which the distinguished chairman is advancing, would be if she were the wife of a private and had two dependents or more, \$100 a month. It seems to me that such an amount is inadequate to provide for sustenance and subsistence for a family.

I therefore ask that the Senate take into consideration before it votes upon this particular section of the armed services pay bill the subsistence allotments for wives and children. We have given a great deal of assistance in quarters allotments for the members of the armed services. We have given recognition to the need of increased pay. But when it comes to a family which is left behind, a real problem in every community, an intimate personal problem for the individuals involved, and a problem of morale for the man who is in the armed services, I submit that the recommendations which are proposed by the Armed Services Committee are very inadequate. I suggest that for the buck private, for a private first class, and for corporals a maximum of \$15 a month as a dependency allotment is an inadequate provision. So, Mr. President, I ask support for the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this amendment only goes to show what a wonderful body the United States Senate is. A good deal of criticism has been expressed in committee over increasing these allowances so far beyond those recommended by the Department and suggested in the House bill.

The Senator from Minnesota finds fault because we have not raised them quite as high as he proposes to go. The Senator referred to a figure of 10 percent, or some such figure, which was allowed in the increase in pay granted to the civilian personnel of the Government.

I should like to point out that this bill raises each and every one of these allowances more than 10 percent above the present scale. It raises them considerably above what the House provided. Indeed, we have gone so far in the case of these allowances that we have almost increased them to the amount suggested by the Senator from Minnesota in his amendment. For example, a private, a man in the lowest rank, now receives \$45 a month as an allowance for quarters.

The Committee has raised that to \$51 a month. Some members of the committee thought that too high. The Senator from Minnesota would raise it \$4 more. In the case of a private with more than two dependents, the committee raised the allowance from \$85 a month to \$100 a month, which is almost 20 percent. The Senator from Minnesota suggested \$105 a month, which is only \$5 more than we have increased it.

Mr. President, in my judgment the committee has dealt most generously with the subject of allowances, and the

only way we were able to do it was by reducing the basic pay rate which was included in the House bill.

I again wish to point out that these allowances are tax-free; and in these days anything one gets that is tax-free makes a considerable difference when we consider the very high range of taxes.

I consider that we have been very generous in this matter. I do not think the Senate would be justified in increasing the allowances above the amounts which have been presented in the committee bill. I hope the Senate will reject this amendment.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I was not in the Senate when the vote was taken on the Douglas amendments. I was presiding at a committee meeting and could not be present.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we have been placing an unfair burden upon those who have been called into the service of their country. The original act was passed in 1942 and was amended in 1944. Since that time, when the cost-of-living index was around 125.5, it has gone to approximately 196. Since the basic legislation was passed, the amount of allotment permitted for the dependents of servicemen has not kept pace with the over-all increase since the base legislation. I am not saying that the committee has not taken this fact into consideration. I say that the general program is reasonable and has been directed at meeting the requirements, but as the Armed Services Subcommittee makes further study of other matters, I ask them to direct their attention to assistance for dependents. I have received hundreds of letters from all over the United States, from social welfare agencies in city after city, which I have introduced into the Record, bringing to my attention the very difficult conditions under which many families are living.

I hope there will be a time in the not too distant future when we shall be able to give some recognition to the larger families, particularly in communities where there are new industries which have forced up the general living costs.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, of course it costs more to take care of a family consisting of a wife and three children than it does to take care of a smaller family. There has never before been any distinction between officers' families with one dependent and families with 6 or 8 dependents. We have made that distinction in this bill. Some commissioned officers actually draw less money than do those in the higher grades of the non-commissioned rank.

I believe we have dealt fairly with the subject. The bill probably will not take care of every family, particularly those with unusual expenses, but, by and large, I think the dependents will be very glad to get the substantial increases which are provided by the bill. I think these increased allowances will greatly alleviate the suffering which is undoubtedly occurring in many homes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We must differentiate between the servicemen's dependency legislation and the Career Compensation Act. One is for the enlisted personnel and the other is for officers. The Armed Services Committee, as it studies the matter, should take into consideration what every agency of the Government has taken into consideration, namely, the percentage rise in the cost of living, and find a base point from which to operate. That base point is found in the legislation which was passed in 1942 and subsequent amendments. The cost of living has gone up approximately 70 percent since that time, and during that period the allotments which have been made for the enlisted men have gone up considerably less. There is a discrepancy which needs to be eliminated. It is on that basis that I have offered my amendment; and I ask for a vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8 it is proposed to strike out all of lines 1 to 3 inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 3. The provisions of this title shall be effective on the first day of the month in which this title is enacted.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I desire to make a very brief explanation of the amendment. The bill started on its legislative course several months ago. The Armed Services Committee reported it on the 5th day of March, and I believe it was the assumption that it would be enacted into law by April 1. Today is the last day of March, and it is impossible to get the bill enacted into law by the first of April, because it will have to go to conference. Assuming it becomes law during the month of April, my amendment simply provides for it to become effective as of April 1 instead of May 1.

Last year, when we enacted legislation to provide pay increases for civilian employees, we dated it back to July 1, or perhaps to January 1. I think it went back a period of 10 months. The amendment would have virtually no retroactive effect but would simply make the effective date April 1, rather than May 1, assuming that the bill becomes law within the next several days. That is all the amendment seeks to do. I believe it is fair and reasonable, and I hope the committee will accept it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I had intended offering a similar amendment, but the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] interposed an objection. Because of his apprehension that it might become law before

May 1, I told him I would not offer the amendment, nor would I support such an amendment. I shall, therefore, vote against the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I suggested to the Armed Services Committee that it make the bill retroactive to the date on which it passed the House. I think the committee members were more or less in agreement with such an amendment, but we were told that it was administratively impossible to operate it. We are advised, however, that the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama would be very easy to administer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I send forward an amendment which I should like to have the clerk state.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

The proviso contained in section 202 (d) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, is amended by inserting immediately after the word "That", a comma and the following: "effective as of June 1, 1942.". Any increased retired pay accruing by reason of the amendment made by this subsection to any retired enlisted man for the period beginning June 1, 1942, and ending June 30, 1946, shall be paid to such retired enlisted man by the Secretary concerned in a lump sum.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I shall take but a few minutes to explain the amendment. It was proposed by me sometime ago, and was submitted to the Committee on Armed Services, but was not included in the bill as it was reported.

In the pay bill of 1942 the group of old soldiers covered by the amendment, who had served in the Spanish-American War, the Boxer Uprising, and in the Philippines, were excluded from the so-called credit pay. That was restored in 1946.

I was chairman of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Military Affairs which reported the bill which took care of that matter, and I know that leaving out these men was an oversight, that our committee did not realize we were taking the pay away from them. As a matter of fact, we inserted a saving clause in the bill which we thought took care of the situation.

Later both Houses of Congress passed a measure restoring this pay, and the President, upon advice from the Army, vetoed it. However, when the pay bill of 1946 was passed, the oversight was corrected, but corrected as of July 1, 1946. The result is that from 1942 to 1946 these few hundred men were deprived of pay to which they had been entitled for the service they had rendered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Can the Senator give the Senate some information as to the estimated amount involved?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; it is estimated that the total cost would be about \$800,000. It does not involve a thing in the world but something for which the Government contracted with these men, and then by act of Congress we took it away from them for 49 months, and never have restored it.

I submit that in all fairness these persons should be added to the pending bill and should be given the pay to which they are entitled. Congress recognized they were entitled to it by restoring it to them in 1946, but it did not grant them back pay which had been taken away from them.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there is much in this amendment which is commendable, but I hope the Senate will not complicate or endanger the pending bill by adding this provision to it. I believe it would cost in the neighborhood of a million dollars. I point out that just as many of the group referred to have died since this payment accrued as those who are alive today. As I understand, the amendment applies only to those who are alive. It does not undertake to correct the situation for the estates or dependents of those who died since 1942. I do not believe the amendment would equalize the situation. I repeat I certainly hope that the Senate will not complicate the pending bill by adding this provision to it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sure the Senator will agree there is an equity involved; will he not?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think perhaps an equity is involved.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly those who are now alive, and who must be around 80 years old, must need the money more than do the heirs or the estates of those who died.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was pointing out that the Senator came in at a late date to correct this matter.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does not the Senator remember that the amendment was before the committee? And I wonder if the Senator heard me refer to what happened in 1942. I am not speaking from hearsay. I was chairman of the subcommittee which reported the pay bill, and we thought we had taken care of the persons involved in my amendment. Later both Houses passed a bill to take care of this restoration, but it was not taken care of until 1946, when provision was written into the law, but for some reason there was no provision for payment for the 49 months which had intervened.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator also said the President vetoed it on two occasions; did he not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. On one occasion, I believe.

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly do not believe we should jeopardize the bill now

pending by inserting a provision which was vetoed by the last two Presidents of the United States, with all the circumstances which make it important that the bill be approved at a very early date.

The Senator has offered one amendment to which the Senate has agreed, and which will help the beneficiaries covered by it. If the Senate adopts the pending amendment, it may result in delaying by several months the time when the bill will finally be approved. I do not believe we should jeopardize increased payment to 3,500,000 men who are now in the armed services by bringing in an outside matter of the kind suggested.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I apologize for the frequent interruptions, but will the Senator again yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator remembers, of course, that in 1946 his committee, along with the similar committee in the House, recognized the inequity which had been done the men to whom I have referred, and restored the pay as of that date.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And the President did not veto the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If we give them the back pay on the same principle, pay them what we owe them, there will be no question about it, and certainly it will not endanger the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. That may be, but I know there have been two or three pay bills which have affected retired pay, which have been enacted since 1946, and this provision was not in any of them, and I see no reason why we should endanger or delay the pending bill, which is so vital to the servicemen and the dependents of the men who are in the service, by inserting a highly controversial provision of the kind proposed. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to insert on page 7, after line 24, the following new section:

SEC. 103. The Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, is further amended by inserting in the third proviso to section 511, after the words "former member of the uniformed services", the words "service as a cadet or midshipman in the case of those members appointed to the United States Naval Academy prior to March 4, 1913." This section shall be effective as of October 1, 1949. Appropriations currently available for pay and allowances of members of the uniformed services shall be available for retroactive payments authorized under this act.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the amendment which I offer will correct what I consider to be a grave injustice to a relatively few individuals of advanced years now on the retired lists.

Prior to 1913, service as a cadet at the Military Academy or as a midshipman at the Naval Academy counted as military service toward retirement. As a matter of fact, such service did count up until a few months ago, when it was suddenly discontinued as a result of a Comptroller General's decision based on the language of section 511 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949. As a result of this decision the military services are demanding the repayment of considerable sums of money from the less than 300 individuals this amendment will affect.

This injustice has been brought to my attention by a boyhood friend, Admiral William R. White, who was appointed to the Naval Academy by the late Senator Marcus A. Smith, of Arizona. Admiral White graduated from the Naval Academy in 1897. Because there were no vacancies for officers in the Navy at the time of his graduation he was appointed a naval cadet. He served as a naval cadet for 2 years, until vacancies occurred and he became an ensign in the Navy. While a naval cadet he served with Admiral Dewey at Manila.

He commanded the collier *Brutus*, which towed the *Monterey* across the Pacific, and when the *Monterey* arrived in Manila Bay the guns of the *Monterey* outranged the Spanish forts, and that brought about the surrender of the Spaniards.

For "eminent and conspicuous conduct," during the bombardment and capture of Manila, and upon the personal recommendation of Admiral Dewey, Naval Cadet White was advanced five numbers on the list of naval cadets by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The Comptroller's ruling not only disallows the time Admiral White spent at the Naval Academy, but also the 2-year period he was serving with Admiral Dewey.

Certainly it was not the intent of the Career Compensation Act to disallow service in battle, regardless of military rank.

I hope that the chairman of the Armed Services Committee will accept this amendment to the pending measure. I am informed that it deals with less than 300 individuals, and the annual cost will be only a few thousand dollars and this amount will decline with the years. The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] joins me in sponsoring the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the condition referred to by the Senator arose through a ruling by the Comptroller General. There is no question about the congressional intent. Through a construction placed on the act of 1949, the question finally got into the hands of the Comptroller General. I am willing to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. HAYDEN. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to increase certain pay and allowances for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BYRD, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. SALTONSTALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the military pay bill, which was passed this afternoon, be printed with the Senate amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 690. An act to permit certain lands heretofore conveyed to the city of Canton, S. Dak., for park, recreation, airport, or other public purposes, to be leased by it so long as the income therefrom is used for such purposes;

S. 1184. An act to extend the Youth Corrections Act to the District of Columbia;

S. 1212. An act to amend section 2113 of title 18 of the United States Code;

S. 1669. An act to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, with respect to payments for the benefit of persons under legal disability;

S. 2085. An act to further amend section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to underwriting and dealing in securities issued by the Central Bank for Cooperatives;

S. 2266. An act to authorize and validate payments of periodic pay increases for temporary indefinite employees of the Department of the Navy within the period of March 17, 1947, to July 1, 1948;

S. 2549. An act to provide relief for the sheep-raising industry by making special quota immigration visas available to certain alien sheepherders;

S. 2677. An act to restore to 70 pounds and 100 inches in girth and length combined the maximum weight and size limitations for appliances, or parts thereof, for the blind sent through the mails; and

S. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution to permit the Federal National Mortgage Association to make commitments to purchase certain mortgages.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Bernard A. O'Reilly to be postmaster at Stephan, S. Dak., which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California desire recognition?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like temporarily to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator cannot do so "temporarily."

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not yield for that purpose right now.

I give notice that tomorrow at some time we shall take up the three treaties which are on the Executive Calendar. Previously it has been stated that before we took up a treaty a day's notice would be given. So I am giving notice now that the three treaties on the Executive Calendar will be taken up tomorrow. I do not think there will be any objection to them.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TOBEY. I notice on the news ticker that the eminent Democrat, James A. Farley, of New York, has just made a statement which I pass on to the majority leader. He stated, referring to the Democratic Convention to be held in Chicago this summer, that there would be more candidates than bees at bee time. Can the Senator confirm that statement?

Mr. McFARLAND. There will be plenty of votes in November, and I am sure there will be a number of candidates, because they will want those votes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is not strictly a parliamentary inquiry.

The clerk will state the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the Executive Calendar go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Executive Calendar will go over.

FISCAL PROCEDURES

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words on the resolution which was adopted by the conference committee of the Republican Party this morning, with relation to the consolidation of the general appropriations, and improved budget procedure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senate will resume the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. FERGUSON resumed his speech, and spoke for several minutes, when the following occurred:

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the Senator from Michigan be permitted to be made as in executive session. I was on my feet. The reason I make that suggestion is that the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is on his way to the Chamber to bring up a matter in executive session. So I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the Senator from Michigan be considered as being made in executive session.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan would like to have that done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that may be done. The Chair thought that what the Senator from Michigan was about to discuss was legislative business, and he declared the executive session over. There was no objection.

Mr. FERGUSON. My statement can be made just as well in executive session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection—

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Did I correctly understand that the Chair had declared the executive session at an end?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes. The Chair stated that, without objection, the Senate would resume the consideration of legislative business, because the Chair thought the Senator from Michigan wanted to discuss legislative business.

Mr. CONNALLY. Granting consent that what the Senator from Michigan says may be considered as being said in executive session does not change the assertion that the executive session has been concluded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; the Chair does not think so. The statement will go in the RECORD as it is made, whether it be in executive session or legislative session.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, my only point was that the Senator from Utah was on his way to the Chamber. I spoke to the majority leader and told him that the Senator from Utah wished to make a statement in executive session. It was at that point, if the Chair will recall, that I was about to suggest the absence of a quorum. I understood that it was perfectly agreeable to the majority leader. The purpose was to give the Senator from Utah an opportunity to reach the Chamber. I did not want any technical parliamentary situation to arise which would foreclose the Senator from Utah from making his motion or statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate can always go back into executive session.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I desire the floor while the Senate is in executive session. It is necessary under the rule.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan will not yield at the present moment because the Senate is in executive session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not agree that the Senate is at present in executive session, because the Chair announced that the Senate would resume the consideration of legislative business. The Chair thought that the executive business had been concluded, and that the remarks of the Senator from Michigan would relate to legislative business and not executive business. There was no objection to the announcement of the Chair.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in order to keep the record straight, my unanimous-consent request was that the remarks of the Senator from Michigan might be considered as being made in executive session. I understood that the question was asked whether there was objection to that request. No objection was raised to considering that what the Senator from Michigan was about to say would be said in executive session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Frequently requests are made that something which is done or said be considered as having been done or said either in legislative or executive session. That does not mean that the Senate is actually in legislative session or executive session, but it means that whatever is done is done as though the Senate were in either legislative or executive session. The Chair has no desire to cut off any Senator or preclude him from doing what he wishes to do in executive session. However, the Chair asked if there was objection to the Senate resuming the consideration of legislative business, and there was no objection.

The Senator from California said he would like to make the point of no quorum, but he did not make it. After that there was a private conference between him and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], in which the Chair was not a participant.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I asked the Senator from California not to suggest the absence of a quorum, because I thought there would be other business which would take up sufficient time to allow the Senator from Utah to be notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Chair's announcement that the executive session was terminated and that the Senate would resume the consideration of legislative business will be abrogated.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Chair has ruled that the executive session has ended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct. The Chair ended it by asking if there was objection to the Senate resuming the consideration of legislative business. There was no objection.

Mr. CONNALLY. That ends it, does it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Supposedly it does. The Chair knew nothing about the intention of the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. The Chair did not know that the Senator from Utah was on his way to the Chamber or what he intended to do when he got here.

Is there objection to the suggestion of the Chair that the Senate resume consideration of executive business? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, as in executive session, I continue with my remarks. I ask unanimous consent that the intervening debate may be placed at the beginning of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Reorganization Act passed by Congress, which is a part of the rules of this body, provides as follows, under the heading "Legislative Budget," in section 138:

SEC. 138. (a) The Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, or duly authorized subcommittees thereof, are authorized and directed to meet jointly at the beginning of each regular session of Congress and after study and consultation, giving due consideration to the budget recommendations of the President, report to their respective Houses a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including the estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for such year. Such report shall contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year which shall include such an amount to be reserved for deficiencies as may be deemed necessary by such committees. If the estimated receipts exceed the estimated expenditures, such report shall contain a recommendation for a reduction in the public debt. Such report shall be made by February 15.

The majority party in the Senate and in the House have failed and neglected, and in fact refused, to carry out that particular section of the rule, so we have no means of ascertaining the amount of the deficit for this year, because we have no estimate of the amount of receipts, and no estimate as to the amount of expenditures.

In 1950 we had a single or one-package appropriation bill. It was possible under the provisions of the single appropriation bill, covering all the appropriations at one time, to estimate the entire cost of the Government.

The Senator from Michigan and the other members of the Republican conference believe that the one-package appropriation bill was of great value in effecting economy and presenting a proper fiscal policy for the Government of the United States. It is along that line that the Senator from Michigan was eager that the conference adopt a certain policy. The Senate Republican conference this morning adopted a resolution which I should like to read to the Senate. It deserves the attention of the whole Senate and the public. The resolution in the main urged three things:

First. A packaged, single appropriation bill.

Second. More adequate staffs to handle the flood of budget requests

emanating from the executive departments.

Third. Improved budget procedures.

All three of these requests speak loudly for more economy. All of us have seen control of the purse strings gradually slip away from Congress.

The Republican Members of the Senate, taking note that very few members of the Democratic majority have done anything in this session toward achieving greater economy and efficiency in the Federal Government, unanimously approved the resolution.

We are certain that, with this resolution, we speak for almost everyone in this country who demands economy in our Government. Since economy-creating legislation has met constant road-blocking from the Democratic majority in this session, the Republicans feel that it is our duty to wage war against waste. We feel that it is every Senator's duty to fight for improved budget procedure and analysis.

Mr. President, I shall read the resolution into the RECORD:

RESOLUTION ON THE CONSOLIDATION OF GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS AND ON IMPROVED BUDGET PROCEDURES ADOPTED BY REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE OF THE SENATE ON MONDAY, MARCH 31, 1952

Whereas the power of the purse is the exclusive constitutional right and responsibility of the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas the efforts of Congress to control expenditures have been repeatedly frustrated by the executive departments of the Government; and

Whereas recurring Treasury deficits, huge Federal outlays for defense, foreign aid, and civilian purposes, including indefensible waste, and the rising burden of the public debt and taxes are fundamental factors in inflation and jeopardize the fiscal solvency of the Nation; and

Whereas there is an insistent and growing demand from the country and the taxpayers that Congress develop a more efficient and effective system of handling the annual appropriation bills; and

Whereas the appropriation process has hitherto been piecemeal in nature, each supply bill being separately considered by different subcommittees in each Chamber, but without consideration of their interrelationships or of the over-all aspects of expenditure and revenue programs; and

Whereas the recurring log-jam of appropriation bills at the end of recent sessions of Congress has required the passage of a series of continuing resolutions to keep the Government going, and handicap the sensible planning of public business; and

Whereas the experiment with the single-package appropriation bill procedure during 1950 was abandoned without adequate experience; and

Whereas it is extremely difficult for Congress to balance the Federal budget unless it is in a position to compare total estimated receipts with total prospective expenditures as set forth in a single-package appropriation bill: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Republican Conference of the Senate, That we favor as a permanent feature of Federal fiscal policy the consolidation into one general appropriation bill of all the regular appropriations for the support of the Government; and be it further

Resolved, That we favor and will support legislation to equip our Appropriations Committees with sufficient trained staffs and other needed powers and facilities to enable the thorough detection and elimination of

waste and useless Government functions so that taxes may be reduced, the budget balanced, and payments made for the reduction of the national debt; and be it further

Resolved, That we favor in principle the creation of a Joint Committee on the Budget as set forth in Senate 913, Eighty-second Congress, first session.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I merely wish to say to my distinguished friend from Michigan, whom I admire very much, that, in my opinion, I think his party is entirely wrong in advocating a single-package appropriation bill. I think it is the most undesirable way of appropriating money I have ever heard of. It is absolutely impossible for the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to do the work that is demanded of him if such a single-package bill is used. When the question arises I shall oppose with all the vigor I possess the enactment of a law providing for such a bill. We used the method during one year, and then abandoned it; and have not used it since.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I desire to second what the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has stated.

On the calendar as order No. 796 the Senate will find Report No. 842, dealing with the consolidated general appropriation bill. Included in the report are my individual views, and contained in those views are statements by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations and by the chairmen of all the subcommittees of that committee, all of them testifying to the utter unworkability of a one-package appropriation bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to interrupt the Senator from Arizona long enough to suggest that he ask that the statements be printed in the RECORD at this point, so that they may be made a part of his remarks. In that way we may have them before us.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask unanimous consent that my minority views and the accompanying statements be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I ask unanimous consent that the views of the majority be likewise printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered, as in legislative session.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is in the Chamber. He had sent word that there was a subject on which he desired to speak in executive session. I merely wanted to make certain, in protecting his right to

make his statement or to submit a motion, that the technicality of having passed from executive session to legislative session would not foreclose him, on the theory that we were no longer in executive session and that in effect we are having two executive sessions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate does not pass from either an executive session or a legislative session merely by agreeing that a Senator may do something as in that session. For example, an executive session goes on just the same if something is put into the RECORD or something is done "as in legislative session." Frequently in legislative session the Senate does things "as in executive session," but that does not change the status of the legislative session.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is the Senate still in executive session?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is still in executive session.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, a few days ago—

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan has the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thought the Senator from Michigan had concluded his remarks.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, we had obtained permission to print some material in the RECORD.

I merely wish to say that I commend most heartily to the Senator an article prepared by Representative JOHN PHILLIPS, of California, in which he discusses in a thorough and detailed manner the single-package appropriation bill. The article was published in the National Tax Journal in the issue of September 1951, and I shall make it a point to see that the Senator receives a copy of that article. I am sure that Representative PHILLIPS' analysis of the situation shows that the one-package bill is a waste of time and a waste of money, and he is joined in that view by a majority of the House Committee on Appropriations, which this very year refused to undertake for a second time the one-package appropriation bill.

EXHIBIT 1

CONSOLIDATED GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL

The Committee on Rules and Administration, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Con. Res. 27) providing for a consolidated general appropriation bill for each fiscal year, having considered the same, report favorably thereon and recommend that the resolution be passed.

The resolution follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That effective on the first day of the second regular session of the Eighty-second Congress, the joint rule of the Senate and of the House of Representatives contained in section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) (1) All appropriations for each fiscal year shall be consolidated in one general appropriation bill to be known as the 'Consolidated General Appropriation Act of _____' (the blank to be filled in with the appropriate fiscal year). The consolidated general appropriation bill may be divided into separate titles, each title corresponding so far as practicable to the respective regular general appropriation bills heretofore enacted. As used in this paragraph the term 'appropriations' shall not include deficiency or supplemental appropriations, appropriations under private acts of Congress, or rescissions of appropriations.

"(2) The consolidated general appropriation bill for each fiscal year, and each deficiency and supplemental general appropriation bill containing appropriations available for obligation during such fiscal year, shall contain provisions limiting the net amount to be obligated during such fiscal year in the case of each appropriation made therein which is available for obligation beyond the close of such fiscal year. Such consolidated general appropriation bill shall also contain provisions limiting the net amounts to be obligated during such fiscal year from all other prior appropriations which are available for obligation beyond the close of such fiscal year. Each such general appropriation bill shall also contain a provision that the limitations required by this paragraph shall not be construed to prohibit the incurring of an obligation in the form of a contract within the respective amounts appropriated or otherwise authorized by law, if such contract does not provide for the delivery of property or the rendition of services during such fiscal year in excess of the applicable limitations on obligations. The foregoing provisions of this paragraph shall not be applicable to appropriations made specifically for the payment of claims certified by the Comptroller General of the United States and of judgments, to amounts appropriated under private acts of Congress, to appropriations for the payment of interest on the public debt, or to revolving funds or appropriations thereto.

"(3) The committee reports accompanying each consolidated general appropriation bill, and any conference report thereon, shall show in tabular form, for information purposes, by items and totals—

"(A) the amount of each appropriation, including estimates of amounts becoming available in the fiscal year under permanent appropriations;

"(B) estimates of the amounts to be transferred between such appropriations;

"(C) estimates of the net amount to be expended in such fiscal year from each appropriation referred to in clause (A);

"(D) estimates of the net amount to be expended in such fiscal year from the balances of prior appropriations;

"(E) the totals of the amounts referred to in clauses (C) and (D); and

"(F) estimates of the total amount which will be available for expenditure subsequent to the close of such fiscal year from the appropriations referred to in clause (A).

The committee reports accompanying each deficiency and supplemental appropriation bill containing appropriations available for obligation or expenditure during such fiscal year, and each appropriation rescission bill, and any conference report on any such bill, shall include appropriate cumulative revisions of such tabulations.

"(4) The committee reports accompanying each consolidated general appropriation bill, and any conference report thereon, shall show in tabular form, for information purposes, for each wholly owned Government corporation or other agency of the Government which is authorized to receive and expend receipts without covering such receipts into the Treasury of the United States and which uses a checking account maintained with the Treasurer of the United States for that purpose (A) the estimated expenditures (other than retirement of borrowing) to be made out of such checking account for the fiscal year, (B) the estimated receipts (other than borrowing) to be deposited in such checking account for such fiscal year, and (C) the difference between (A) and (B).

"(5) The provisions of paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) shall not be applicable to appropriations of trust funds or to transactions involving public-debt retirement.

"(6) No general appropriation bill shall be received or considered in either House unless the bill and the report accompanying it conform with this rule.

"(7) The Appropriations Committees of the two Houses may hold hearings simultaneously on each general appropriation bill or may hold joint hearings thereon.

"(d) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized when requested by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives to transmit to said chairman, as soon as possible, a current estimate of the overall Federal receipts for the ensuing fiscal year."

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 27) was introduced on April 17, 1951, by Senator Byrd for himself and Mr. Gillette, Mr. O'Connor, Mr. Wherry, Mr. Bridges, Mr. Butler of Nebraska, Mr. Ferguson, Mr. Knowland, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Bricker, Mr. Butler of Maryland, Mr. Cain, Mr. Capehart, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Clements, Mr. Cordon, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Duff, Mr. Ecton, Mr. Flanders, Mr. Hendrickson, Mr. Hennings, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Ives, Mr. Jenner, Mr. Johnson of Colorado, Mr. Kem, Mr. Lodge, Mr. Martin, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Schoeppel, Mr. Smathers, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Mr. Smith of New Jersey, Mr. Smith of North Carolina, Mr. Taft, Mr. Thye, Mr. Tobey, Mr. Welker, Mr. Wiley, Mr. Williams, Mr. Young, and Mr. Malone.

The general purposes of the resolution are—

(a) To consolidate all regular annual appropriations into one regular annual appropriations bill;

(b) To limit the amounts of obligations under multiple-year appropriations during each fiscal year; and

(c) To provide pertinent information for the Congress, showing the estimated effect on expenditures of the obligational authority provided by appropriations for each fiscal year. Information also would be provided for appropriations made in prior years, appropriations made available for more than one fiscal year, and authority for the use of receipts.

In more detail, this concurrent resolution would amend section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, effective on the first day of the second regular session of the Eighty-second Congress. It would require a consolidated general appropriation bill covering all appropriations for each fiscal year, except deficiency or supplemental appropriations, appropriations under private acts of Congress, or rescissions of appropriations, and divided into separate titles corresponding so far as practicable to regular general appropriation bills heretofore enacted.

The resolution directs that with certain specified exceptions each consolidated general appropriation bill and each deficiency and supplemental general appropriation bill containing appropriations available for obligation during each fiscal year shall set limitations on the net amount to be obligated during such fiscal year in the cases of appropriations available for obligation beyond the close of the year. It further directs that each consolidated general appropriation bill limit the net amounts to be obligated during the fiscal year from prior appropriations available for obligation beyond the close of such fiscal year. The required limitations are not to be construed as prohibiting contracts otherwise authorized, provided the value of property delivered or services rendered during the fiscal year is not in excess of applicable limitations on obligations.

The resolution would require committee reports, including conference reports, accompanying each consolidated general appropriation bill, to show in tabular form per-

tain information as to the amount of each appropriation, including estimates of amounts becoming available in the fiscal year under permanent appropriations; estimates of amounts to be transferred between appropriations; estimates of the net amount to be expended during the fiscal year from each appropriation and from the balances of prior appropriations; and estimates of the total amount available for expenditure subsequent to the close of the fiscal year. Committee and conference reports accompanying deficiency and supplemental appropriation bills and appropriation rescission bills would be required to include cumulative revisions of the tables.

Information would also be required in committee reports as to the estimated expenditures, other than retirement or borrowing, to be made out of checking accounts of Government corporations or other agencies authorized to receive and expend receipts without covering such receipts into the Treasury, estimated receipts, other than borrowing, to be deposited into such checking accounts, and the net difference between receipts and expenditures. Appropriations of trust funds and transactions involving public debt retirement would be exempt from the limitations and informational requirements of the resolution.

Other provisions of the resolution would authorize the Appropriations Committee to hold simultaneous or joint hearings on general appropriation bills and would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury, when requested by the chairman of either the House or Senate Appropriations Committee, to transmit a current estimate of the over-all Federal receipts for the ensuing fiscal year.

The idea of a consolidated appropriation bill has been advanced twice before, and actually tried in one session of the Eighty-first Congress.

In 1947, on March 24, May 1, and June 24, hearings were held on Senate Concurrent Resolution 6 providing for a consolidated appropriation bill. This resolution was unanimously approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration and put on the Senate Calendar, but was never acted upon.

In 1949 the idea was again advanced in the form of Senate Concurrent Resolution 18. Hearings were held on this measure by this committee on May 23 and May 26, 1949. The committee reported the resolution to the Senate, which approved it on September 27, 1949, but no action was taken on it in the House of Representatives.

Meanwhile the House, in 1950, on the initiative of its Committee on Appropriations, had taken up the one-package idea, and there had been introduced in that chamber the bill (H. R. 7786) entitled "The General Appropriations Act" which carried all the general appropriations of all the agencies and departments in one package. This measure came to the Senate on May 11, 1950, and was passed on August 4, 1950. The President signed the bill on September 6, 1950.

When the same idea was proposed as an act of the House Committee on Appropriations, however, in this session of Congress, it was rejected by a vote of the committee. Nonetheless the majority of this committee believes that one more trial, at least, should be had on the omnibus appropriation bill. This belief is based in substantial part upon the conviction that a single-package bill will mean substantial reductions in appropriations.

This concurrent resolution, if adopted, also will add vastly to the information to both branches of Congress on governmental expenditure. It will make it impossible for the House Appropriations Committee to change the procedure of appropriation from year to year. Under its provisions limitations on obligations against current appropriations along with those being carried over from

prior years would be written into one appropriation bill. That part of those appropriations which would be carried over for obligation in later years would be shown in committee reports. Thus, this bill would show what part of the appropriation made in one year would be expended in the next year or subsequent years thereto, and likewise what expenditures would be made in this current fiscal year from appropriations of prior years.

Since this Government is now running on a cash basis of receipts and expenditures, no provisions for obligations are made to take care of obligations which have to be met in the next fiscal year. Hence, this resolution would make one general appropriation bill show what moneys would be spent in future fiscal years, together with what expenditures were carried over from previous appropriations. In this way it would be possible to get an expenditure budget in comparable comparison to revenue receipts and a better idea whether the Government is operating with a surplus in the year to come or with a deficit.

As drafted, the concurrent resolution does not do away with contractual obligations, but would provide a limitation on the amount of cash that may be spent against any contractual obligation within any particular fiscal year.

This concurrent resolution will provide a limitation on how much may be spent in a particular year so that any appropriation bill can be put on an expenditure, rather than an appropriative, basis. There are many expenditures carried over from previous appropriation bills not included in a succeeding fiscal year but under this resolution a consolidated appropriation bill will set them forth as separate items.

Congress has difficulty in determining actual expenditures even after such detailed studies as those made by the Bureau of the Budget have been made. Budget studies by the Bureau begin many months in advance and the actual figures arrived at in the President's message in January may have changed within the months consumed to prepare them. Congress, therefore, has a right to know more of what to expect in the way of actual expenditures than of intended expenditures. This consolidated appropriation bill will show just that. For this reason paragraph (b), page 5, of the resolution is a direction upon the two committees to get up-to-date estimates from time to time.

It may be very burdensome to operate on a pay-as-you-go basis, but it will at least hold down expenditures to that point where the people being appraised of Government expenditures and experiencing increased taxation will ultimately demand that excessive spending be reduced. This is the only salvation for this Government in the future.

It is one method, also, whereby public attention may be focused on the total impact of general appropriations requested of and made by the Congress for the support of the Government during any certain fiscal year.

"Under the bill, committee reports on the consolidated general appropriation bill will show, in tabular form, for information purposes, by items and totals:

"(a) The amount of each appropriation, including estimates of amounts becoming available in the fiscal year under permanent appropriations—we have three or four different kinds of appropriations, as you know.

"(b) Estimates of amounts to be transferred between appropriations—that is quite important. The President has the right, as the chairman knows, to transfer.

"The CHAIRMAN. Where it is specifically granted in the bill.

"Senator BYRD. Correct.

"(c) Estimates of amounts to be expended from each of the appropriation items.

"(d) Estimates of amounts to be expended from balances brought over from prior ap-

propriations, which is a very considerable item each year.

"(e) Total expenditures from all sources; and

"(f) Estimates of amounts to be carried over for expenditure in later years.

"We make an appropriation this year and frequently it is not spent for probably 1 or 2 years.

"Committee reports accompanying deficiency, supplemental, and rescission bills, along with reports from conference committees, would include appropriate cumulative revisions in the tabulations in the report on the consolidated bill.

"Under paragraph 4 on page 4 the bill sets forth the manner in which receipts and expenditures of Government corporations and those from Treasury checking accounts should be shown in the committee reports tabulations.

"Paragraph (d) on page 5 authorizes the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee and the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee to request the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit current estimates of over-all Federal receipts for the coming year to be covered by the appropriation bill.

"This in itself, if used sympathetically and realistically, would be a tremendous step in the direction of balanced budgets.

"At least we will know with more definiteness and certainty when we pass appropriations bills whether we are going into deficit spending or not."

(The foregoing quote is from the transcript of Senator BYRD's appearance in this connection before the Rules and Administration Committee.)

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF MR. HAYDEN CONSOLIDATED APPROPRIATION BILL Statement

A consolidated general appropriation bill was again tried last year, during the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, as a legislative procedure, after a lapse of more than a century.

The bill proved to be bulky, unmanageable, and impracticable. Originating in the House of Representatives, it placed legislative burdens on both branches of Congress which became intolerable. That the House of Representatives, itself, was discouraged with the idea was conclusively shown by a vote taken last January in its Committee on Appropriations. At that time a motion was presented to again consolidate all the supply bills into one as a policy of that committee to be accepted by the House. The motion, according to newspaper reports, was rejected, 31 nays to 18 yeas, and the House has since sent the customary separate appropriation bills to the Senate. Hon. SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, Speaker of the House of Representatives, has stated:

"I was opposed to this method of appropriating funds from the beginning but many of our friends wanted to give it a try. After what has happened in the last Congress, I am more convinced than ever that it was a mistake."

As will appear in the statements by other members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, there are numerous valid objections to a consolidated appropriation bill, in all of which I concur. Two considerations appear to me to be of particular importance.

1. Evasion of Congressional Responsibility

For lack of time toward the close of a session of Congress, the Senate cannot give as careful consideration to the details of one large appropriation bill as has been customary when separate bills are received from the House of Representatives in the earlier months of the year. Blanket reductions or percentage cuts are therefore proposed, the

effect of which is to transfer responsibility from the Congress, where it belongs, to the heads of departments or agencies who can pick and choose as to what authorized activities shall be retarded or abandoned. Senators and Representatives thereby concede either that they do not have the ability or lack the courage to bring about specific reductions in expenditures.

If it becomes a practice for Congress to make across-the-board reductions in annual budget estimates, the departments and Federal agencies will be under temptation to pad their requests for funds in anticipation of such meat-ax cuts.

2. Presidential Veto

The consolidated appropriation bill opens the way to legislative riders being attached to it, and consequently to the threat of a Presidential veto to overcome such riders.

A veto, if sustained, would result in great confusion, coming, as it must, toward the end of a session of Congress when amendments to any and all parts of the consolidated bill, when reintroduced, would be in order.

Objections based upon experience

Based upon their actual experience last year, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations and the chairmen of all of the subcommittees of that committee are opposed to the enactment of Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, as is shown by the following extracts from statements by each of them which appear in the printed hearings:

KENNETH MCKELLAR, a Senator from Tennessee, chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations and chairman of the Subcommittee on Army Civil Functions:

"1. 'Complete picture of appropriations' a misnomer.

"The comment is made that by the one-package bill the Congress and the public can have a complete picture of the amount of appropriations and expenditures.

"Last year, the one-package bill for 1951 was enacted into law by September 6, providing about \$34,000,000,000, of which four billion for foreign aid was added by the Senate. Immediately behind it, the first supplemental for 1951 was enacted into law on September 27, providing for seventeen billion, and then before the session adjourned in December the second supplemental for 1951 was passed, providing for almost twenty billion additional. Then in this year, the third supplemental for 1951 and the fourth supplemental for 1951 were enacted in May and June, providing for four hundred million and for over six billion additional. Therefore, the one-package bill for 1951 gave the Congress and the public a picture, not of 100 percent of the 1951 funds, but actually of only 43 percent of those funds.

"The fact is that, particularly under present-day conditions, it is impossible to have all of the appropriations required during a fiscal year in one package.

"2. Unequal consideration by committees of House and Senate.

"In order to report the one-package bill for 1951 by March 21, the House began hearings early in January and divided its committee membership into subcommittees of five, so that they could hold nine meetings simultaneously. Attendance of committee members at the hearings was assured, since that is the sole committee function of each of the members.

"The one-package bill was passed by the House on May 10 and was reported to the Senate on July 8. In the intervening 8 weeks the Senate committee had to complete hearings by all of its subcommittees on all chapters of the bill, consider and mark up the individual chapters, and have them approved by the full committee. There were many complaints by Senators that they had notices of four subcommittee meetings simultaneously, and the usual result was that the sub-

committee chairman on each chapter held most of his hearings alone, or with intermittent attendance by two or three of his subcommittee members. Some of the subcommittees tried to meet the situation by holding portions of their hearings before the House bill was reported, but the action on the mark-up and approval by the full committee must necessarily await the passage of the House bill.

"3. Timing of appropriation bills.

"Last year the one-package bill for 1951 funds was reported to the House on March 21, passed the House on May 10, reported to the Senate on July 8, passed the Senate on August 4, and was approved by the President on September 6.

"Comparing the dates with prior years, the 1946 bills were all enacted by July 3, the 1947 bills were all enacted by July 26, the 1948 bills were all enacted by July 31, and the 1949 bills were all enacted by June 30. In the year before the one-package bill, the 1950 bills were all enacted by September 6 except for Interior, civil functions, and military. And this year, all 1952 bills have been enacted except for civil functions, legislative, defense, and State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary, and two of these are awaiting appointment of conferees by the House.

"4. Availability of Senators for appropriation meetings.

"The time of the regular members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations is not completely available for the business of the committee at all times, as is the case with members of the House committee. Included among the regular members of the Senate committee are the President pro tempore of the Senate, the minority leader of the Senate, 9 chairmen out of the 15 standing committees, 2 ranking minority members of standing committees, and the balance of the regular membership holding important positions of lesser seniority on standing committees of the Senate. Also, among the ex officio members of the committee are 2 chairmen and 2 ranking minority members of other standing committees. While the wide scope of this representation of the business of the Senate is of the utmost value to the committee in its work, the time consumed by their duties on legislative committees serves to greatly shorten the time available to Members for attending hearings and considering and deciding upon individual items of appropriations. While an appropriation bill is passing through the procedure from subcommittee to full committee to floor consideration and adjusting differences in the conference committee with the House, there is constant conflict in the times and dates set for the various meetings required. In addition, since each member of the committee is a member of four or five subcommittees, Senators can never find the time necessary to spread their attendance over all of the meetings it is necessary to schedule.

"5. Delay in providing needed funds.

"In the cumbersome and unwieldy procedure of the one-package bill, it is necessary to plow through the hundreds of pages of such a bill and complete the action on the whole bill before the required funds would be available for any part of the operation of the Government, no matter how important the function may be and no matter how urgent may be the need for such funds.

"In addition, if there should be a deadlock in the conference with the House on any part of the bill, the entire bill must suffer the delay, regardless of the importance of the other portions of the bill which could otherwise become law without such delay. Conceivably, a powerful block could indefinitely tie up all the funds of Government in order to force an issue which might affect the funds of only one agency.

"The delay incident to the one-package bill also becomes extremely important in connection with an item which is so urgently

required that the funds are made immediately available on the passage of the bill.

"6. Comprehensive score of estimates and appropriations available.

"The comment is made in support of the one-package bill that Congress never has any comprehensive idea of the total score of its money measures until the last bill is passed.

"As a matter of fact, the comprehensive tables submitted with the President's budget in January of each year give a clear picture of the estimates of appropriations, expenditures, and receipts, and even an estimate of the surplus or deficit; and all of the work of the Committees on Appropriations and on revenues are directly related to that January budget submission. Every item in every appropriation bill is 'scored' on the basis of how much it is below the budget estimates, and every consideration by the Congress ties directly back to the proportion each item bears to the total budget and to the estimated deficit.

"The figures on the progress and the 'scoring' of appropriations in relation to the estimates is always available in the committees. In fact, the Congressional Digest now carries a summary table at the end of each month, which is obtained from committee data and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, showing the relation of appropriations to estimates for each bill, and how much each bill has reduced the estimates."

RICHARD B. RUSSELL, a Senator from Georgia, and chairman of the Subcommittee on the Department of Agriculture:

"The principal argument of the proponents of the bill that it will promote economy is, I think, disproved by the facts and by experience. In dollars and cents, I dare say, we have reduced the appropriations more for the fiscal year of 1952 under the separate-bill idea than was done in the one-package bill for the year 1951.

"The principal extravagance of the one-package bill, however, is the waste and inefficiency it promotes in Government. Under the one-package plan, not a single agency, bureau, or activity of Government can definitely plan its work until the President has signed the one-package measure. Under normal circumstances, all but one or two of the departmental bills are cleared by the beginning of the fiscal year, or the 1st of July. The agencies affected by the appropriations know exactly what the Congress proposes for them to do and can set about their work. We will indeed be fortunate if we can ever get a one-package bill to the President before the middle of September. This means that not a single agency of Government whose appropriations are in controversy can really plan its work for the fiscal year before that time. For more than 2½ months the departments are marking time at very wasteful expense without knowing definitely what the Congress proposes for them to do.

"Experience teaches us that the appropriations for public works and for foreign aid usually cause more controversy than any others. Consequently, they are the last to be agreed upon in the Congress. There can be no earthly excuse for permitting delay on these measures to cause the state of wasteful confusion and uncertainty for 2½ months in all of the other activities of the Federal Government. By way of illustration: Why should vital research work in the Department of Agriculture, or the nature and scope of the farm program for the next year in that Department be delayed for 2 or 3 months while the Congress debates whether or not we will build a certain dam?

"It is my considered opinion as a result of my service on the Committee on Appropriations during my tenure in the Senate that appropriations will be more carefully considered and more dollar-and-cent econ-

omies effected under the separate-bill theory. I know that the separate bills make for much greater efficiency and economy in the expenditure of the appropriations finally voted. Millions of dollars are practically wasted by causing those agencies affected by 9 or 10 appropriation bills to mark time until the Congress agrees upon highly controversial items which should be in a tenth or eleventh separate bill."

PAT MCCARRAN, a Senator from Nevada, and chairman of the Subcommittee on the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary:

"The basic argument that is advanced for having a one-package bill is that it will show Congress in one bill what they will be called on to appropriate, and that as a result great savings can be made. The proponents argue that the one-package bill will force the Congress to make savings, whereas when appropriations are carried in a number of bills, such is impossible. With this basic concept in mind, following are the reasons why I do not look with favor on this proposal:

"I contend that the omnibus appropriation bill will not accomplish its primary purpose of making it easier to economize in governmental expenditures. Economy is an attitude which takes an act of will to place into operation. The final decision must be made by the respective Members of the Congress as to each item of appropriations, taking into account any or all of the facts that each Member wishes to consider in regard to a particular item. After a review of all of the facts, each Member must then reach a decision as to whether he individually favors a reduction, an increase, or the budget estimate. I submit that in arriving at this decision the Member is not influenced in the least by the fact that all of the appropriations are in one bill, any more than he would be if the appropriation bills were printed on yellow paper.

"The Senate is not set up to handle efficiently an omnibus appropriation bill. There are too few Senators for subcommittees; therefore they cannot handle the various chapters simultaneously, as is done in the House. In addition, many Senators on the Appropriations Committee are also chairmen of other major legislative committees. While this is extremely valuable to the Appropriations Committee, it does constitute an additional drain on the time of individual Senators. These factors become important when viewed in relation to the timing involved as to when the omnibus bill is received from the House and the subsequent period allowed for consideration by the Senate.

"The omnibus bill lends itself to across-the-board cuts, a system with which I very much disagree. I strongly believe that each individual item should be considered on its merits and a separate decision arrived at for that particular item. This is a system which the Subcommittee for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary has followed, since I have been chairman of that subcommittee. I believe that the system has worked very well, that economies have been made, and that at the same time each item has received full and fair consideration.

"As you know, the omnibus bill last year contained a section wherein authority was delegated to the Bureau of the Budget to assess a \$550,000,000 cut. Part of this cut was placed against hospital construction, and there was an immediate protest from Congress that it should not have been placed against that item, but against some other item. I submit that Congress should have made the cuts in the first place.

"The omnibus-bill system puts before the Appropriations Committee and before the Senate a bill which contains so many varied items that it is impossible to digest these items intelligently. Senators who are not

members of the Appropriations Committee find it impossible to give adequate and full consideration to all the many appropriation items in the omnibus bill, when it reaches the floor for debate. The pressure to secure passage of the bill at the late date it is presented is tremendous.

"I strongly favor economy in government and favor curtailing appropriation requests wherever possible. However, I also strongly believe that before any cuts are made, fair and adequate consideration should be given to each request. Then an individual decision should be made on each item as to whether a change in the item is necessary. If enough Members of Congress feel the same way about the item, the change should then be made by the Congress.

"I again stress the point that economy is an act of will. Orderly procedure is necessary so that an intelligent decision may be reached. However, no procedure will substitute for the ultimate decision that must be made; the most that any procedure can do is to make the facts more readily available. The omnibus bill, as a method of procedure, does not, in my opinion, make the facts more readily available. It tends to confuse the issues involved. If the Congress is ever to achieve intelligent economy, each individual Member must arrive at his individual decision that a reduction is what he will support. This decision must be based on the merits of the issue involved; it cannot be based on the procedure used in arriving at the facts with which to make the decision."

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, a Senator from Wyoming, and chairman of the Subcommittee on the Armed Services:

"In response to your request for an opinion on the relative merits of the so-called one-package appropriation bill as compared with several different bills for departments and agencies, it is my frank opinion that the latter method is by far the better.

"It is not only easier for the Appropriations Committee as a whole, but it is easier for the subcommittees charged with the responsibility of the various appropriations categories. More important, however, it seems to me to be decidedly in the public interest because it makes it possible for Congress to pass at least some of the bills before the beginning of the fiscal year, and thus eliminates dependence upon continuing resolutions. The latter device, it seems to me, is not economical because it results in authorizing the departments affected to use appropriated funds without the detailed scrutiny to which they should be subjected.

"When we have a one-package bill, every department must wait for its funds until all the chapters of the single package have cleared.

"As you know, the Armed Forces bill did not pass the House until August 9. Fortunately, our subcommittee began hearings on June 7. Although the Senate passed the bill on September 13, the House is not yet ready to go to conference, and we have not had final action upon the defense bill. Under the one-package system all of the departments would still be waiting for their bills, and would be operating under continuing resolutions.

"It seems to me there is no economy in going back to the one-package system."

DENNIS CHAVEZ, a Senator from New Mexico, and chairman of the Subcommittee on the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency:

"From my experience I would say that more thought can be given to appropriation bills when they are considered by the individual departments. That has been the procedure with the exception of 1 year when we handle it all in one package. Subcommittees of the different departments would hold their hearings, but eventually had to wait until the House finally acted on the one-package bill.

"In my opinion, the one-package bill makes for delay, indifference, lack of thought and attention."

BURNET R. MAYBANK, a Senator from South Carolina, and chairman of the Subcommittee on the Independent Offices:

"I feel as Senator BYRD, that we should reduce expenditures to the minimum, but we had the single appropriation bill some years ago. I voted for it, but it proved to be totally useless from a practical standpoint because only the old-line Government agencies were included in the bill. Foreign aid and ECA were exempted and, of course, all deficiency bills. More than 80 percent of the Government spending goes for past wars and future wars and the Appropriations Committee has cut to the bone the old-line departments.

"You cannot reduce the interest on the debt, and unless you repeal the law passed by the Congress you cannot materially curtail the Veterans' Administration. The Atomic Energy Commission and the stock-piling program, together with the veterans, take up as much money as all of the other bills. Then when you add to this the appropriations for the armed services, everyone on the Appropriations Committee realizes that this is where the real money goes. The single appropriation bill saved no money but created greater debt with the supplementals that followed."

ALLEN J. ELLENDER, a Senator from Louisiana, and chairman of the Subcommittee on the Legislative Branch of the Government:

"The plan is impractical. I don't see how it would be possible for each Senator on the Appropriations Committee to study in detail the appropriations for the various departments of Government. The subcommittee procedure places the responsibility for studying and reporting appropriations for a particular department in the hands of a few Senators who make a study of all the details of the appropriations under their jurisdiction. You will recall that the omnibus appropriation bill we experimented with during the last session of Congress could not be handled as a whole, but we had to resort to the subcommittee method previously in effect. As a matter of fact, the work grew cumbersome, particularly when it became necessary to have conferences to iron out differences between the two Houses. Many Senators served as conferees on titles of the omnibus bill with which they were not acquainted, and those who actually made the study were oftentimes left off.

"It is certainly not a time saver. I believe rather that it is time consuming. All bills do not require the same length of time for hearings. The ones entailing the longest hearings will retard the passage of those that are ready for action by the Senate."

LISTER HILL, a Senator from Alabama, and chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia:

"I have served on the Senate Appropriations Committee when the committee has had the single-package bill and when the committee has had the separate bills. My experience on the committee convinces me that the committee can function more intelligently and more effectively in behalf of economy and wise expenditures with the separate bills.

"From the standpoint of our Government, its efficiency and economic operation, I hope there will be no return to the single-package bill."

HARLEY M. KILGORE, a Senator from West Virginia, and chairman of the Subcommittee on the Treasury and Post Office Departments:

"The consolidation of all appropriations into one appropriations act, whatever the theoretical arguments in favor of it, is in actual operation a wholly impractical, unwieldy, cumbersome, inefficient, and unbusinesslike method of handling appropriations.

"As a member of the Appropriations Committee and as chairman this year of the subcommittee handling the appropriations for the Treasury Department and the Post Office, I have had an opportunity to compare at first hand the two methods. The inadequacies of the so-called one-package appropriation became glaringly obvious last year.

"The one-package approach provides a far less adequate way of determining the real needs of the departments and agencies of the Government, and makes the achievement of proper economies in governmental operations correspondingly difficult.

"I hope that the lessons which were painfully learned with the one-package approach last year will not be ignored."

The following report on Senate Concurrent Resolution 27 was submitted by the Director of the Budget which suggests that prior to the adoption of the resolution the President should be authorized to veto items in any consolidated appropriation bill:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., July 12, 1951.
HON. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and
Administration,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: This is in reply to your letter of June 1, 1951, in which you request an expression of our views on Senate Concurrent Resolution 27. This resolution would amend the joint rules of the Congress to provide for a consolidated general appropriation bill for each fiscal year, to require that appropriation bills contain certain provisions to limit obligations, to require that committee reports accompanying appropriation bills contain certain tabulations of expenditure estimates, and to make certain other changes in the rules.

I see no particular technical problems involved in the draft resolution.

The basic question, however, is one difficulty which I have pointed out to the committee earlier on similar resolutions; namely, the fact that a single appropriation bill magnifies the problem of legislative riders on appropriation acts. In the report of the committee on a prior resolution dealing with the consolidated appropriation bill, this problem apparently was recognized, as was the obvious solution; that is, the granting of an item veto to the President. The experience with the consolidated appropriation bill last year strengthens my belief that a single appropriation bill is fertile ground for the inclusion of legislative riders despite provision in the current Senate and House rules relating to legislation in appropriation bills.

It seems to me, therefore, that from the Executive point of view it would be better to first provide for the item veto before action is taken to consolidate appropriations into one bill.

Sincerely yours,

F. J. LAWTON, Director.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], on July 7, 1949, in reporting Senate Concurrent Resolution 18 of the Eighty-first Congress, which is identical with Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, indicated the need for an item veto, but the bill which he and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], then joined in introducing (S. 2161), merely authorized the President to impound sums of appropriated money, the expenditure of which he determines is not in the public interest, but granted to the President no authority to disapprove legislation attached to an appropriation bill.

In his report the Senator from Wyoming stated:

"During the course of the hearings, the committee had before it for consideration a draft of proposed legislation which would

permit the President, upon his finding and determination that the expenditure of any single item of appropriation, or any portion of an item in a consolidated general appropriation bill is not in the public interest, so to notify the official of the Government in whom the authority to make such expenditure is vested. Upon receipt of such notification, the amount specified in such finding and determination immediately would be covered into the Treasury and would be unavailable for expenditure or obligation unless subsequently reappropriated by the Congress, in which event the President would be without authority to find and determine that this reappropriated money is not in the public interest. Legislation of this type would avoid the constitutional question which is an inevitable part of any discussion on the granting of the item veto power to the President."

CARL HAYDEN.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, do I correctly understand from the Senator from Arizona that he has put the entire report in the Record?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. So the views of the Senator from Arizona and the views of the majority of the committee also are included, are they?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand that the views of the majority of the committee are opposed to the views of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. President, I anticipated that my remarks would bring objection from the majority side. As I have said, the majority has refused to comply with the budget law which requires that a legislative budget be prepared at the beginning of each year.

We on this side of the aisle realize that with a budget of \$85,400,000,000 this year, there are objections from the majority side to operating in such a way as to make it possible to see the entire picture at one time, to have Congress consider the entire picture, and to realize at the time when it is passing the appropriation bills that it is operating on a deficit budget or deficit spending of approximately \$14,400,000,000.

I realize how easy it is as we go along, for the majority to pass appropriation bills, not knowing their real effect upon the deficit. In the case of the second appropriation bill, it will also be true that at the time when we act on it we shall not know what its effect on the deficit will be and we shall not know what the deficit will be.

Finally, we shall come to the time when the last appropriation bill will be passed. The chances are that it will be a bill from which the full \$14,400,000,000, required to balance the budget, could not be taken. Then we shall find ourselves in the position of having passed the appropriation bills, and then—at the end of the session—we shall have deficit spending.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is the single appropriation bill the one which the able senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who has been very much interested in the problem of economy in the Federal Gov-

ernment, for a number of years has felt would be a major contribution to a reduction of the expenses of the Federal Government?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. The distinguished senior Senator from Virginia has been advocating this method. As chairman of the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, he knows that we as a Congress must be able to see the entire picture at one time, if we are to know what we are doing.

The purpose of the Reorganization Act was to have the Congress, through its committees who are responsible for the fiscal policy, consider the entire picture and determine how much we would go into the red or how much we would be able to pay on the debt or how we could proceed with a proper fiscal policy. However, that act has been ignored. We understand that the majority will object to having us obey this provision of that act because they wish the Executive branch to have control of the budget. They do not want Congress to have control of the purse strings, although constitutionally the control is lodged in the Congress, not in the executive branch.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield further to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As a matter of fact, is it not correct that the so-called La Follette-Monroney Reorganization Act is still on the statute books?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; it is still on the statute books, but it is absolutely ignored.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield further to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Did not that act also provide that after the various fiscal committees—namely, the Ways and Means Committee of the House, the Finance Committee of the Senate, and the Appropriations Committees of the two bodies—estimated the receipts and estimated the expenditures, if the expenditures exceeded the receipts, as they do by approximately \$14,000,000,000 in the President's budget, then those committees would have upon them the responsibility of bringing in a concurrent resolution increasing by that amount the borrowing power and the national debt?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is absolutely correct. I shall read section 138 (b) of that act. Previously I read up to that point in the act. As the Senator from California has pointed out, the report of those committees of Congress should have included the following:

SEC. 138. (b) The report shall be accompanied by a concurrent resolution adopting such budget, and fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year. If the estimated expenditures exceed the estimated receipts, the concurrent resolution shall include a section substantially as follows: That it is the sense of the Congress that the public debt shall be increased in an amount equal to the amount by which the estimated expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year exceed the estimated receipts, such amount being \$—.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me at this point?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. President, here is what that law requires those committees to do: At the beginning of the session, they are to determine how much the income of the Federal Government will be. From what we can learn now, it looks as if the Government's income would be approximately \$7,000,000,000. Therefore, those committees should have submitted a concurrent resolution providing that the public debt be increased in the amount of \$14,500,000,000, if they wanted to have the Congress appropriate the full amount of the President's budget.

However, instead of them doing that, we are going along blind to the fact of what the national debt will be. We shall pass the appropriation bills as they come along, not realizing what the total will be, until we arrive at the end of the last appropriation bill, probably in the last few days of the session. In fact, I shall be surprised if the total is known until shortly before we take a recess, probably about midnight of the day Congress takes a recess. Up to that time, Congress will not know how much the deficit will be.

Now I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Is it not a fact that the reason for that provision of the La Follette-Monroney Act was the need to raise a danger signal at the beginning of the session, so the public and the country as a whole would be on ample notice that Congress was proceeding with a deficit-financing program? Was not that the very reason for the provision regarding a concurrent resolution, namely, so that the Nation could ascertain whose was the responsibility, and could do so in the early part of the session, not when it was too late?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is absolutely correct. That is the reason why provision was made that the report should be made by February 15.

I realize that at the beginning of the first session following enactment of the La Follette-Monroney Reorganization Act, it was difficult to comply with that part of the provisions of the act within the length of time specified. However, thereafter, and every year thereafter, particularly this year, our committees could have begun at any time before February 15 and could have ascertained the facts from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, if Congress had set up, with a proper staff, a committee which could have tackled the job. Then we would have been able to comply with the requirement by the 15th of February; and then the people of the United States would have known what Congress was going to do regarding the budget, the deficit, the national debt, and the relationship between income and expenditures. In that way it would have been indicated that if it was the intent of Congress to appropriate a total of \$85,400,000,000, with an income of only \$71,-

000,000,000, there would be deficit spending in the amount of \$14,400,000,000.

However, instead of doing that, the public and the Congress will not know, until midnight of the day when a recess or adjournment of Congress is taken, how much the deficit will be. Then the effect of that deficit upon the Nation will be great, because it will be added to the already-existing inflation, and will reduce further the value of the 53-cent dollar which we now have in the United States.

AUTHORIZATION FOR VESSELS OF CANADIAN REGISTRY TO TRANSPORT IRON ORE BETWEEN UNITED STATES PORTS ON THE GREAT LAKES

Mr. WATKINS obtained the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President—
The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There is on the desk Senate bill 2748, Calendar 1281, a bill authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes during 1952. We have had to extend this authority from year to year because of a lack of tonnage or ships on the Great Lakes.

The urgency of passing this bill now arises because the ice on the northern routes is breaking up, and it is desirable that this commerce be begun this week.

Therefore, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield for that purpose?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I do not yield for that purpose. I shall speak only a few minutes. If the Senator from Washington wishes to bring up the bill after I have spoken, that will be satisfactory.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have made this request because I have been waiting for half an hour or more.

Mr. WATKINS. So have I.

MOTIONS TO RECONSIDER MUTUAL DEFENSE TREATY BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND THE PHILIPPINES, AND SECURITY TREATY BETWEEN AUSTRALIA, NEW ZEALAND, AND THE UNITED STATES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah has the floor, and the Senate is in executive session.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, a few days ago the Senate considered the security pacts with Australia, New Zealand, and the Philippines. On those pacts the Senate took action by means of voice votes. I call attention to the fact that the Senate took rather hasty action on those very important treaties.

I am in full accord with the statement made by the majority leader some time ago, that there should be a yea-and-nay vote on any treaty of that kind. I personally feel that there ought to be some legislative history made in this Chamber on those treaties.

I have had time to make merely a rather cursory examination, but I find, for instance, that we bind ourselves indefinitely to help the nations mentioned by way of mutual aid and support; and those treaties contain substantially the same language which is found in article 3 of the North Atlantic Pact; but they do not contain the same language which appears in article 11 of the North Atlantic Pact.

It is said in these special security treaties that they are to be ratified by the constitutional processes of the countries which are parties to them. The North Atlantic Pact, as we all know, provides that each party shall not only ratify, but shall also carry out the provisions according to its constitutional processes.

Personally I am in favor of the general purposes and objectives of these two treaties, but I think they ought to be given a little further consideration, and that we ought to make legislative history and consider their possibilities. Unless the legislative history gives a clear-cut interpretation of just what the powers are under them and what is intended to be done, then possibly an interpretative statement ought to be in the resolution of ratification. For the reasons stated I move to reconsider the votes by which the respective treaties were ratified. First, I would like to move to reconsider the vote by which the security pact with the Philippines was ratified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has moved to reconsider the vote by which that treaty was ratified.

Mr. WATKINS. I now move to reconsider the vote by which the treaty with—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Only one motion can be before the Senate at a time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I move to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CONNALLY. Wait a moment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from California withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not happen to favor the move being made by the Senator from Utah, but, merely from a parliamentary point of view, I want to know whether he may enter both of his motions today; because, if the Senate now adjourns, there may be a question as to whether the second motion could be entered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah has made one motion, and he may enter the other one; but it is not pending until the first one is passed on.

Mr. WATKINS. I wish to enter the other motion to reconsider the vote by which we ratified the security pacts with New Zealand and Australia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas moves to lay the first motion on the table.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McFARLAND. If the Senate should recess until tomorrow, then the motion would be voted upon tomorrow, would it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would if the Senate were in executive session.

Mr. McFARLAND. The motion to table is not debatable, is it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No, it is not debatable. The motion to lay on the table is not debatable.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas kindly withhold his motion until the Senator from Washington may obtain the floor for the purpose of placing something in the RECORD?

Mr. CONNALLY. I wanted to say something regarding the question which has arisen.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion of the Senator from Texas to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Utah is not debatable.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. What would be the status with respect to giving notice of or entering a motion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The status would be that the Senator entering the motion would have to call it up at a later date, in executive session. It is not pending, and cannot be pending until the first motion is passed on.

Mr. CONNALLY. It, therefore, is not subject to a motion to lay on the table?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Not now. It would be when it is called up.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, may I present a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. McFARLAND. Am I correct in my understanding that the motion is not debatable?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion to lay on the table is not debatable.

Mr. McFARLAND. Am I further correct in my understanding that no business can be transacted for the present, while that motion is pending?

The VICE PRESIDENT. While the motion is not debatable, the Senate might, by unanimous consent, suspend action on it to take up other matters.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Washington may transact certain business, as in legislative session, without jeopardizing the motion of the Senator from Utah or the motion of the Senator from Texas to lay it on the table; also that—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, for the sake of the record, and as a matter of parliamentary procedure, it seems to me that the motion of the Senator from Texas would effectively foreclose even brief statements on the part of the Senator from Utah as to the reasons for his feeling that the motion which he has made

should properly come before the Senate. I expect to vote against the motion of the Senator from Utah, but it seems to me that if the able Senator from Texas would withdraw his motion to lay on the table—

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I understand he has withdrawn it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; he has not, I believe. We, at least, might have a brief discussion, and perhaps we could agree on fixing the time for discussion, prior to a vote on the motion to lay on the table.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. As I understood, Mr. President, it is the present ruling that the motion to lay on the table is not in order at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; the Senator from Utah made his statement, and then made his motion, after which he yielded the floor. The Chair thereupon recognized the Senator from Texas, who then moved to table the motion made by the Senator from Utah. That motion is in order. Then the Senator from Utah inquired about another motion to reconsider, in connection with another treaty. Such a motion is not in order, but the Senator may enter it, and he may call it up at a subsequent time.

Mr. WATKINS. That is what I understand, and I have entered that motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator entered the motion on the second treaty.

Mr. CONNALLY. When the Senator presented his original motion he made a statement about it. I see no reason why he should make another statement tomorrow; but I shall not object. If the majority leader wants to grant such a request, I shall not object.

Mr. McFARLAND. I inquire how long the Senator from Utah wants to speak?

Mr. WATKINS. I did not know whether the motion would be taken up tomorrow or at some other time.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I made a unanimous-consent request, and I am, of course, speaking on that. But these treaties are important. It is important that they be disposed of. They have been pending for some time. I feel that it is our duty to dispose of them tomorrow. If we should postpone action any further, the delay would be misunderstood. I just asked the distinguished Senator from Texas whether he would be willing to withhold for a reasonable time his motion to lay on the table. If he would do that, we might be able to agree on a reasonable amount of time within which to discuss the motion—say, 30 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. WATKINS. It may take a little longer than that. This is a very important matter, and the majority leader himself has said that on treaties of this kind there ought to be a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. McFARLAND. I said notice should be given of their consideration.

Mr. WATKINS. Was any notice given, when we were discussing the Japanese Peace Treaty that the Senator was going to move to proceed to the consid-

eration of the security pacts? If there was, I was not aware of it.

Mr. McFARLAND. I think notice was given and I believe it was generally understood that the respective treaties would follow one after the other. As a matter of fact, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] thought there was a limitation of time on the two treaties to which the Senator from Utah has referred. We had given notice, and everyone understood they were to be brought up. I must insist on disposing of these treaties.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is being very fair in his statement, and I think that, very properly, these treaties should be disposed of tomorrow. My only point was that it did not seem to me that the Senator from Utah should be foreclosed by the motion to lay on the table. I wonder whether it would be agreeable to have a limitation of not to exceed 1 hour to a side.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is too much time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands the Senator from Texas has withdrawn his motion to lay on the table.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senate takes a recess, will not the motion to table go over until tomorrow?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, let us see whether we can work out this situation. Would the Senator be willing to agree to an hour to a side on both motions?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The motions are similar.

Mr. McFARLAND. Would the Senator agree that the motions may be consolidated and voted upon as one motion, with an hour to a side?

Mr. CONNALLY. I think an hour to a side is too much time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Not for two motions.

Mr. McFARLAND. Of course, Mr. President, if I may say so to my good friend from Texas, the situation is that when the first motion is called up there can be an hour of debate before the motion to lay on the table is made. I think we would gain time by handling it in that way, because we could vote on one motion without any debate at all, and the other could be discussed for another hour.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have made a motion to table. If the Senate should take a recess, will not the motion go over until tomorrow?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be the pending motion when the Senate returns to executive session.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am agreeable to 30 minutes to a side, for both motions.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I do not expect to speak very long on the matter. If that is the best the Senator from Texas will do, I shall agree to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Texas withdraws his motion to lay on the table, and, without objection, the two motions, the one which is already made and the one which is entered, will be consolidated, and debate will not exceed 30 minutes on a side. The Senator from Utah will control 30 minutes and the Senator from Texas will control 30 minutes.

The unanimous-consent agreement as subsequently reduced to writing is, as follows:

Ordered, That debate on the motions of the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] to reconsider the votes of the Senate on Thursday, March 20, 1952, advising and consenting to the ratification of the mutual-defense treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines (Exec. B, 82d Cong., 2d sess.), and a security treaty between Australia, New Zealand, and the United States of America (Exec. C, 82d Cong., 2d sess.), be limited to not exceeding 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. WATKINS and Mr. CONNALLY, respectively.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the Senate resuming the consideration of legislative business? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CANADIAN SHIPS TO TRANSPORT IRON ORE BETWEEN UNITED STATES PORTS ON THE GREAT LAKES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1281, Senate bill 2748, authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes during 1952.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to have the Senator from Washington state whether the report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was unanimous?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It was a unanimous report. It is very urgent that the bill be passed, because the ice is breaking up at this time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Would the Senator be willing to make a brief statement as to what the bill would accomplish?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. Ever since the war, Mr. President, because of the lack of ore tonnage on the Great Lakes, we have had to allow Canadian vessels to haul some of the iron ore which was so desperately needed. We have renewed the authority from year to year. It was pointed out again this year that there was a similar need because of the failure of United States operators to build sufficient ore carriers. We are told that this is the last year when authorization of Canadian ships to transport the ore will be needed. We are told that next year there will be sufficient American ore boats to handle the situation. The bill provides for a renewal of the authorization until the end of this year.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have no objection.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2748) authorizing vessels of Canadian

registry to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes during 1952 was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, by reason of emergency conditions in transportation on the Great Lakes, notwithstanding the provisions of section 27 of the act of June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 999), as amended by the act of April 11, 1935 (49 Stat. 154), and by act of July 2, 1935 (49 Stat. 442), or the provisions of any other act, or regulation, vessels of Canadian registry shall be permitted to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes until December 31, 1952, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation may designate.

NEGOTIATION AND RATIFICATION OF CERTAIN CONTRACTS WITH CERTAIN INDIANS OF SIOUX TRIBE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to bill (S. 2408) to amend the act authorizing the negotiation and ratification of certain contracts with certain Indians of the Sioux Tribe in order to extend the time for negotiation and approval of such contract, which was, on page 2, line 2, to strike out "twenty-seven" and insert "twenty-eight."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the amendment of the House is different from the bill as passed by the Senate only in that it changes the length of time from 28 to 27 months in which certain negotiations can be undertaken with the Indians. There is no objection upon the part of the author of the bill, the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. I therefore move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, House bill 6030, to amend the act authorizing the negotiation and ratification of certain contracts with certain Indians of the Sioux Tribe in order to extend the time for negotiation and approval of such contracts, will be indefinitely postponed.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on the morning of March 28 the New York Times printed what I regard as a very excellent editorial on Senate Joint Resolution 20 which will be under further consideration by the Senate on Wednesday of this week. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, urging the passage of the joint resolution reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BATTLE OVER OIL

The Senate will have the opportunity next week to take a progressive step in resolving sensibly the 14-year-old battle between some States and the Federal Government over control of oil lands beneath the marginal seas. It can take this step by approving Sen-

ator O'MAHONEY's interim resolution (S. J. Res. 20) which would permit development of this great natural resource under Federal auspices but with important concessions to the claims of the Coastal States.

Or the Senate can move backwards by accepting the counterproposal to make a free gift of the lands to the States, despite repeated Supreme Court decisions that the Federal Government has paramount rights to the oil areas in dispute. The argument is anything but theoretical. It involves an estimated \$40,000,000,000 worth of oil reserves, which shall be used either for the benefit of all the people of the United States or for the benefit of the people of the three principal Coastal States (California, Texas, Louisiana) off whose shores the oil happens to lie.

As Senator PAUL DOUGLAS said: "When you strip away all the legal gobbledygook the offshore oil issue comes down to this: Will the Congress take away \$40,000,000,000 of resources which belong to the 48 States and give them to 3 States?" The House last year passed a measure giving the States everything out to the 3-mile limit; and if the Senate follows suit the bill will almost certainly be vetoed, as it should be. On the other hand, if the Senate adopts Mr. O'MAHONEY's compromise proposal the States will still profit greatly, while the Federal Government will retain the ultimate control of the land which the Supreme Court says it rightly has.

Broadly speaking, the O'Mahoney bill recognizes leases already issued by the States; authorizes Federal issuance of new leases but, for the next 5 years, only with consent of the States if the lease is within the 3-mile limit, and grants the States three-eighths of the total revenues from operations within the area during that period. Development of the oil lands has been seriously hampered by legal complications since the Supreme Court decisions, and this measure would facilitate resumption of full-scale activity. Actual exploitation of the undersea lands would, of course, continue to be carried on by private enterprise, while ultimate control would rest with the Federal Government, where it belongs.

An amendment to the O'Mahoney bill, offered by 19 Senators, provides that the royalties accruing to the Federal Government from the oil operations be eventually distributed among all the States for educational purposes. There is a great deal to be said for the idea, as in this way there would be clear and direct benefit to the people of all the States.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S SERVICE TO THE NATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a great American and a beloved President announced to the American people on Saturday evening that he would not again seek or accept the nomination to succeed himself as President of the United States.

Harry S. Truman served his fellow Americans and the Government of the United States well. In my opinion, the judgment of history will place the name of Truman alongside the names of Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Wilson, and Roosevelt as among the greatest Presidents in our Nation's history.

I have come to know our President and to admire him. He represents the best in our democratic traditions. In him and through him the American people have realized to the maximum the

American objective of democratic government, "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

Mr. Truman became President of the United States at a time when our Nation was thrust into the role of world leadership. His was the responsibility for making decisions, the burden of which had implications more vital, more pressing, and more awesome in their effect on the peoples of the world than any which have devolved upon any other living American. He has been called upon to make decisions with regard to the use of the atom bomb, the Potsdam conference, the conference of the United Nations at San Francisco, the threat of communism to Greece and Turkey, the Marshall plan, the point 4 program, the North Atlantic Pact, and the resistance to Communist aggression in Korea. In my judgment these decisions have given the world a hope for lasting peace and for the survival of human dignity in our civilization. For that, he will have the gratitude, the affection, and the respect of generations to come.

The decision of President Truman to leave the White House next January presses upon the American people a great responsibility to choose a successor worthy to carry on in the traditions which he has advanced. Many leaders in both political parties now are offering themselves as candidates for that high position. It is not my purpose at this time to express a preference for either one or another of those candidates. It would furthermore be presumptuous for me to offer advice to the Republican Party. I do, however, have some words of counsel for those within my own party who offer themselves to be standard bearers of the Democratic Party in the forthcoming Presidential elections. That counsel can best be expressed by my reference to an editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on February 25. It is entitled "Not Always to the Swift."

President Truman is beloved by the American people because of his candor, honesty, frankness, and principle. He received the support of the American people because he represented in the minds of the American citizens the bold principles of the New Deal and the Fair Deal. The Democratic Party has a responsibility to choose for its candidates for President and Vice President of the United States candidates willing, eager, and determined to carry on in those traditions and faithful to a Democratic Party political platform committed to the foreign policy of the administration and to a domestic program of parity and progress for agriculture, full and equal civil rights for all, public power—REA, social legislation, development, and conservation of our natural resources, free collective bargaining, and defense mobilization. That is the program of the Democratic Party. This is our record. It is the record that has earned and received the support of the American people.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial from the Wall Street Journal printed in the body of the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT ALWAYS TO THE SWIFT

Last week a Republican defeated a Democrat in a special congressional election in Queens County, N. Y. The politicians of both parties are giving the event more meaning than it has but even so, it seems to us, are overlooking the lesson that it does have.

That moral, if you like stories to have morals, is that it's hard to win races by running backwards.

The defeated Democratic candidate in this normally Democratic stronghold had a short, sweet explanation for his defeat. "Truman licked me." He meant that the troubles of the Truman administration, and the scandals in particular, had put an unpopular brand on him as a Democrat that he could not overcome.

Now this is quite possibly true. It certainly serves as a convenient excuse for defeat and gives wonderful comfort to the Republicans; if true, it suggests the GOP can settle back and ride into the White House this year on silken cushions. But if Mr. Truman is to be credited with the out, we think the defeated Mr. Hugh Quinn should be marked with an assist.

What happened to Mr. Quinn was pretty much what happened to Mr. Dewey in 1948. He was nominated to run on a party record that he thought was an unpopular one, and so the instant the race began he tried to run away from the record.

Mr. Quinn was nominated as a Democrat. He was supported by the Democratic organization, including President Truman. If elected he would have been a Democrat. But he tried to disavow the Democrats, including President Truman. He was in an absurd position.

Mr. Dewey in 1948 was nominated as a Republican. He was supported by the Republican organization, including the men who had made what Republican record there was in the Congress. If elected, he would have been a Republican. But he tried to disavow the only Republican record there was, that record in Congress. He too was in an absurd position.

Mr. Truman, in that same 1948, was beset by a record that almost every member of his party agreed was unpopular. Hardly anyone gave him the ghost of a chance. Other Democrats were running away from him and his record as fast as they could.

But Mr. Truman didn't run away from his record. He ran with it. He waved his colors on high, with courage and with pride. He had sense enough to know that no matter how hard he tried he could not escape the record and therefore the thing to do was make the best of it. That, he surely did.

We do not suggest that Mr. Quinn, had he worn his stable colors boldly, could have won. The present handicap may be too much for anyone. We do suggest that he helped himself not in least by running as a Democrat while trying to disavow the Democrats, that in this way he practically guaranteed his defeat.

And we do not think Mr. Truman will run away from his record this time, either. The braid on his colors may be faded and the edges tattered; but that record is an emblem of many colors and, whether we like it or not, there are many parts of it that appeal to many people. Mr. Truman, if we measure our man right, will see that they are put to the forefront, whoever may be bearing them. If his colors don't end up at the head of the parade this time it won't be because Mr. Truman ran away from them.

They may, in spite of everything, finish in front once more next November. They are, indeed, very likely to if some of the GOP colorbearers don't learn this elementary lesson in political racing.

The Republican record, for good or ill, is the one made in Congress, the only place the Republicans have to make one. If the Republicans try to run away from this record, as some of them seem to be bent on doing, and try again to embrace some of the Democratic colors on foreign policy, on big budgets, on "welfare" spending, they could well end up like Mr. Willkie, Mr. Dewey once, Mr. Dewey twice, and Mr. Quinn. Without party prejudice we can say that any politician will have trouble running in the wrong shoes.

Or, to put it another way, the race is not to the swift if they are running fleetly in the wrong direction.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to read one paragraph from the editorial:

Mr. Dewey in 1948 was nominated as a Republican. He was supported by the Republican organization, including the men who had made what Republican record there was in the Congress. If elected, he would have been a Republican. But he tried to disavow the only Republican record there was, that record in Congress. He too was in an absurd position.

Mr. Truman, in that same 1948, was beset by a record that almost every member of his party agreed was unpopular. Hardly anyone gave him the ghost of a chance. Other Democrats were running away from him and his record as fast as they could.

But Mr. Truman didn't run away from his record. He ran with it. He waved his colors on high, with courage and with pride. He had sense enough to know that no matter how hard he tried he could not escape the record and therefore the thing to do was make the best of it. That, he surely did.

The editorial continues by pointing out that the job of Democrats is to embrace that record, hold their banners on high, carry forward that record to the American people, and let the people judge it on the basis of accomplishments.

RESIGNATION OF DEFENSE MOBILIZER CHARLES E. WILSON

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on March 30 it was announced to the Nation that Charles E. Wilson, Defense Mobilizer, had resigned. The reason for Mr. Wilson's resignation is of such importance to the preservation of defense stabilization legislation for the Nation, as well as of importance to us generally, that we should reanalyze what our course should be.

The Washington Evening Star of Monday, March 31, 1952, contains an editorial entitled "Collapsing Controls," which is most timely, and I desire to read it:

COLLAPSING CONTROLS

The resignation of Defense Mobilizer Charles E. Wilson raises a question that goes beyond the equities of the formula proposed for settling the steel dispute.

Mr. Wilson's position seems to come down to this: He does not believe that the Wage Stabilization Board's proposal—wage and benefit increases that will aggregate 26 cents an hour over an 18-month period—is justified. In his judgment it constitutes a serious threat to the stabilization program. Nevertheless, in the interest of avoiding a steel strike, he had urged management to negotiate with the union on the WSB basis, and had indicated that the Government would grant some price rise to cover the higher costs.

Mr. Wilson thought he was doing this with President Truman's approval. Mr. Truman

disagrees. He says he does not regard the WSB recommendations as unreasonable, and suggests that the steel companies can absorb the whole cost without a price increase. In any event, he is unwilling to give assurance of any price increase unless and until the need for it is demonstrated.

This, in Mr. Wilson's view, amounted to a repudiation of the assurances he had given the steel operators, and forced his resignation. Mr. Truman accepted the resignation, and named his labor adviser, John R. Steelman, to succeed Mr. Wilson on a "temporary" basis.

At this juncture, it is difficult to say whether Mr. Truman pulled the rug from under Mr. Wilson, or whether their difference is merely a product of misunderstanding. It can hardly be doubted, however, that the President's attitude in this instance adds up to a surrender to pressure from Philip Murray and his steel union. Nor is there any reason to suppose that Mr. Truman will resist comparable demands that will be forthcoming from other unions, and there is even less reason to suppose that Mr. Steelman will resist them.

The net result is to bring into question the wisdom of continuing the present stabilization program after its expiration date this summer. A control program that is applied with political considerations will be ever present. Congress' program, and in an election year the political considerations will be ever present. Congress should take a long look at this aspect of the matter before voting to renew the program.

Mr. President, as a member of the committee that is considering the proposed defense-control legislation, I have certain misgivings as to continuation of the consideration of the legislation, in view of the fact that Defense Mobilizer Charles Wilson saw fit to resign. Naturally, it is hoped that some equitable situation may be worked out so that we can continue that type of legislation, if any is needed, but, in my judgment, as the matter is progressing at the present time, there is no need to continue defense controls beyond the date on which they were originally meant to expire.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have listened to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Kansas in respect to wage stabilization, and some of the difficulties it has encountered, as high lighted by the resignation of Mr. Charles E. Wilson. I think all of us recognize that Mr. Wilson has given distinguished service to the Nation, and we regret he has tendered his resignation.

I wish to say, however, that the Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations listened for more than an hour and a half to the testimony of Dr. Nathan P. Feinsinger, the very able, competent, and distinguished Chairman of the Wage Stabilization Board, and a member of the faculty of the University of Wisconsin Law School, who has had years of experience in the field of labor-management relations and is a leader and an expert in the field of collective bargaining.

In the light of his testimony, which I heard, and which all the American people must understand, there has been no wage adjustment in the steel industry since December 1, 1950. Moreover, we were given to understand that since December 1950, practically every major industry in the United States has had one or more wage adjustments, and adjustments of what are called fringe bene-

fits, such as health, welfare, and pension funds.

I think it is fair to say, from the testimony which our subcommittee heard, that the benefits which have been recommended by the Wage Stabilization Board for the steel industry will not bring the steel industry up to a comparable status—I repeat, will not bring the steel industry in its relationship with its employees up to a comparable status—with the automotive, electrical, and agricultural machinery industries, and other industries in which there have been wage increases.

That was indicated this morning in a letter from the General Electric Corp., the company of which Mr. Wilson was formerly president. In a labor news letter of the past month to employees of the General Electric Corp., the personnel or labor relations officer of that great corporation stated that even if the Wage Stabilization Board's recommendations were met, even if they were accepted by the steel companies, the employees of General Electric would be far out in front, in terms of wages and so-called fringe benefits.

I also wish to point out that from evidence introduced at our hearing this morning, there are many industries in the United States which have more elaborate so-called health, welfare, and pension benefits for employees than does the steel industry, or than it would have even under the proposals of the Wage Stabilization Board.

To those who say these proposals will incite or will lead to inflation, to those who say this is only a come-on or lead-on for further wage increases, let me set the record right. This is but a catch-up for thousands of employees presently employed in the steel industry of the United States.

One fact which the Senate should understand is that from December 1950 to the date of expiration of the contract, and as recommended by the Wage Stabilization Board, the increase in steel workers' wages will be, under the proposals, 6¼ cents an hour per annum. The total increase in terms of direct wages and fringe benefits, as proposed in the Wage Stabilization Board's recommendations, is 20.7 cents for a period of 31 months.

I think that when the American people understand that the Wage Stabilization Board, instead of recommending a 1-year contract, was able to recommend an 18-month contract, and when they take into consideration the fact that the amount of money that was recommended by the Wage Stabilization Board is far below what the union asked for, and was within the Wage Stabilization Board's formula, they will appreciate the excellent job the Board has done.

In conclusion, let me say that this is no time, during a period of defense mobilization, to be attacking the Wage Stabilization Board. The record of this Board in defense disputes is beyond comparison. It has yet to fail. It has found a solution in every one of 21 disputes which have been voluntarily assigned to it, and I believe some 11 disputes which have been referred to it by the President of the United States, upon

which it has worked thus far. This is an enviable record of labor management peace in the United States. The Board has done this without the use of injunctions. It has done it by a series of recommendations and by proposals which were sound and meaningful both to employer and employee.

So I submit that there has been considerable misrepresentation in the channels of communication. There has been considerable misrepresentation by radio commentators and in the press of the United States, as to what this Board has done.

I also submit that if we want a settlement between the steel industry and its employees we need to keep the atmosphere one of cordiality, one of fair play, and one of responsible representation of the facts.

The facts in this case are crystal clear. In being able to work out a program or proposal which meets modern needs in terms of the so-called fringe benefits and the economic gains which should be coming to a group of workers who have had a contract during a period of inflation the Wage Stabilization Board has literally accomplished wonders. I remind the Senate that there has been no wage adjustment in the steel industry since December 1, 1950—none whatsoever for more than 2 years. No other industry in the United States has been confronted with such a situation.

Finally, let me suggest to those who say that this action will set off a spiral of wage increases that they are apparently unaware of the fact that in some of the big industries of the United States there are 5-year labor contracts. There is no way that this action can cause a spiral of wage increases, on the basis of contractual relationships which are enforceable in the courts of the United States.

I think these facts should be in the RECORD before we set aside or condemn a formula and a program which have worked to perfection in terms of labor-management peace and productivity in the defense plants of the Nation.

RECESS OUT OF RESPECT TO THE MEMORY OF FORMER SENATOR WALLACE H. WHITE, OF MAINE

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, as a mark of respect to the memory of our late colleague, former Senator Wallace H. White, of Maine, and in accordance with the resolution which has previously been adopted, I move that the Senate stand in recess, as in executive session, until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, in executive session, until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 1, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 31 (legislative day of March 24), 1952:

IN THE AIR FORCE

Lt. Gen. Howard Arnold Craig, 17A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States

Air Force, to be Commandant, National War College, with rank of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 504, Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidate for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be pharmacist, effective date of acceptance:

Victor F. Serino

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following officers of the United States Coast Guard Reserve to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the United States Coast Guard:

Robert H. Scarborough

Sydney M. Shuman

John F. O'Connell

The following officers of the United States Coast Guard Reserve to be ensigns in the United States Coast Guard:

William K. Vogeler

Salvatore J. Bardaro, Jr.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy:

William B. Abbott III Townsend E. Blanchard

Charles C. Abeles Donald F. Blodgett, Jr.

Robert B. Abernethy William K. Blount

Richard F. Ackerman Emmett J. Boggs

James M. Adkins Russell L. Boggs

Donald C. Agnew Orville W. Bolcourt

Kenneth M. Albert Justin C. Bolger

D. R. Alford Richard S. Borerl

Robert R. Allen Walter S. Bortko

Walter G. Alwang Donald E. Bowman

Tommy K. Anaston, Jr. John J. Boyle

James A. Andersen, Jr. Richard J. Boyle

Herbert H. Anderson Donald G. Brady

Thor H. Anderson William J. Brandel, Jr.

George H. Andretta Dean W. Brandfuss

Lincoln Aquadro Richard E. Brandow

Frederick W. Armstrong Thomas H. Brennan

Ivy H. Atkins, Jr. James L. Bright

Robert D. Ausherman Philip V. Bright III

Russell N. Babcock Ramon M. Brinkman

Carl F. Bachle, Jr. Philip T. Briska

James E. Bacon Robert A. Broenen

Milton B. Badt, Jr. James C. Brooks

John J. Bahm Ardra G. Broshar, Jr.

William R. Bailey John C. Broshar

Joseph C. Baillargeon, Jr. Gideon L. Brown, Jr.

Charles N. Bainbridge Harry S. Brown, Jr.

Raymond E. Baker Richard N. Brown

Kenneth S. Bakke Willoughby D. Brown

Alfred H. Balch John H. Brownley

Louis D. Baldrige, Jr. John M. Brueger

Meredith H. Baldwin Charles M. Bryant

Leslie H. Balmain Edward A. Brunner

Henry J. Baluta John J. Buckley

Robert C. Barnett Edward Bunnenberg, Jr.

Gerald R. Bassett Wayne S. Burchfield

Peter C. Battin Lawrence L. Burckmeyer

Glenn C. Baublitz Richard L. Burger

Frank T. Bauchspies Gerard Burke

James R. Baum Donald F. Busch

Aubrey H. Bazemore Cornelius F. Butler

Irving J. Bean Henry S. Byrne

Glenn A. Beck Edward C. Calhoon

Harry W. Bedell Ellsworth L. Calhoun

Wayne "L" Beech Donald A. Cameron

Thomas J. Bennett James A. Canter

Walter D. Bennett Stewart J. Carlson

Theodore M. Berg Robert J. Carlstead

Lawrence N. Berkley John H. Carnahan

Bob W. Berry Edward E. Carroll

Maxwell K. Berry Richard R. Cassafer

Raymond L. Berry, Jr. Donald G. Casser

James M. Bestler Joseph B. Cassidy, Jr.

Oscar F. Beumel, Jr. Elliott Cates

David M. Bevington Bruce M. Causey, Jr.

Victor A. Bihl Robert L. Cave, Jr.

Robert L. Bingham John R. Chadwick

Waller T. Blackwell Jeff "D" Chalk III

Robert M. Blair Robert A. Chalmers

Leo J. Chamberlain Robert C. Chandler, Jr.

Robert L. Chasse Richard L. Churchill

John T. Cizek John T. Clizek

Whaite M. Clark John J. Cleary

Neil E. Cleaver John B. Clegg

Richard L. Clough James R. Clowe

John J. Clutz, Jr. Virgil W. Cobb

Robert L. Cockburn Thomas J. Coe, Jr.

Edgar T. Coene, Jr. Francis C. Collins

Jack G. Collins Robert A. Collins

James R. Conrey Richard E. Conway

Willard O. Conyers Robert T. Copenhagen

John J. Fuller II Ira L. Couch, Jr.

James E. Gaebler Harry D. Cox

Lawrence C. Gallen Thomas J. Craig

Francis Crawford, Jr. Walter L. Crawford

Gilmore B. Creelman III Barry A. Cruikshank

Daniel S. Curran Lowell F. Curran, Jr.

Charles Dailey James W. Danaher

Clifford M. Danneel Charles H. Davidson

Christie H. Davidson Paul G. Davies

Benton V. Davis, Jr. James G. Davis

James R. Davis James R. Davis

Jinnie E. Davis William K. Davis

Hessel L. Davison John W. Desjardin

George D. Detwiler Jaime E. Dickerson

Otto W. Dieffenbach, Jr. Thomas M. Dixon

Charles H. Dodson, Jr. Humphrey Doermann

Charles E. Dooley, Jr. James B. Donihee

Thomas E. Donoho Gerald H. Dorman

John P. Doty William C. Doyle

William J. Doyle Frank D. Drake

Harry D. Dreger David I. Dresser

Oliver E. Drummond Ernest A. Duff

Richard M. Dufour Frank M. Duke

Gordon S. Dunham Duane E. Dunwoodie

Roger A. Dysart James E. Eakin

Conrad K. Eastman Robert J. Eberhart

Richard McC. Eckert Timothy W. Edlund

Thurston M. Egbert Burton M. Eggan

Raymond D. Elrich Gervase F. Eline, Jr.

Charles L. Elliot John E. Enander

John P. Engberg John D. Engels

Frank B. Ensign, Jr. Robert A. Epping

Charles S. Epstein Edwin S. Epstein III

John R. Evanco James W. Evans

Newell LaM. Erickson, Jr. Howard W. Ewy

Michael F. Fadden Frank C. Fariss

Kenneth F. Farmer Richard L. Farquhar

Gerald L. Fehrman Edward M. Fenn

Thomas T. Fenton William F. Ferguson

John S. Fessenden, Jr. Robert D. Fielder

John T. Finnegan, Jr. Charles T. Fischer

Nathan M. Fitzgerald, Jr. James H. Flaherty, Jr.

Michael P. Flaherty Henry P. Fonville

Robert L. Foster Erasmus G. Fowler

William L. Fowler Thomas H. Freeland

III John J. Fuller II James E. Gaebler

Lawrence C. Gallen Martin B. Gantt, Jr.

Theodore D. Gardiner John Garofalos

Robert G. Garvin Donald E. Gash

George C. Gatje John O. Gauthier

Lin T. Geiger John R. Gerdes, Jr.

Carl R. Gerling Eugene F. Gerwe

Herbert C. Gery, Jr. John P. Geyman

Robert B. Gledraitls James M. Gifford

Albert R. Gilgen Martin J. Gillan III

Richard W. Gillies James J. Glenn, Jr.

James N. Glerum John J. Gloria

Jack P. Goldschmid, Jr. John A. Golenor

George V. Goodin Ansel V. Gould

William B. Graham, Jr. William G. Gray, Jr.

Morris J. Green Ernest H. Greene

Donald E. Griffith Don W. Griswold

Andrew E. Groves Ralph E. Grossheim

John Gusdonovich, Jr. Martin J. Haest

John F. Half Andrew E. Hall

Arthur N. Hamilton Thomas L. Hampton

Lyle G. Hangartner Ernest R. Hanna

William A. Hansen Loyd B. Hardesty

Albert L. Harlow Edwin F. Harper, Jr.

Douglas H. Harris John R. Hart

John L. Hatcher Conrad F. Hawk

Frederick T. Heigl Robert A. Heins

Franklin R. Helt, Jr. John E. Hermann

Henry N. Herndon, Jr. Paul J. Hess

Harry C. Hewett, Jr. James F. Hickey

William E. Hildebrandt John W. Hill

Clifford E. Hoenie Robert L. Hogan

Elmore Holmes III Richard A. Holmes

Richard J. Horn Gordon J. Hornberg

Robert J. Hostetler William V. Hovey

John K. Howell Earl M. Hudson

Eugene L. Huesgen Lynne H. Hull II

Franklin G. Hunt John A. Hunt

John E. Hurley Donald Husmann

Kemper K. Hyers William J. Hynes

Harold E. Ikeler, Jr. Irving Itzkan

Barry D. Ives Emmette G. Jackson, Jr.

Charles E. Jacobs, Jr. Richard N. James

George G. Jarboe Charles H. Jarvis

Robert R. Jay Howard E. Jensen

George M. Jezek Robert E. Jobin

Alan H. Johnson Bruce L. Johnson

David D. Johnson Eric W. Johnson

Frederick W. Johnson, Jr. Philip E. Johnson

Ronald C. Johnson Earl H. Jones, Jr.

William A. Jones Jack B. Joyce

Nelson V. Judah Carl C. Kaczmarek

Edward T. Kaprowski Jack G. Kay

Herbert W. Kebschull Robert W. Marrion

William E. Keeney, Jr. James V. Marron

Emmette E. Keese Michael M. Marshall

Robert F. Kelley James P. Martineau

Robert J. Kelly Charles R. Martz, Jr.

Patrick D. Kenan Dan C. Mathes, Jr.

David R. Kennedy, Jr. Harland F. Mayes, Jr.

Martin H. Kennedy Jared D. Mayes III

Robert C. Kennedy Ronald N. Meader

John J. Kenny Louis F. Meardon

Jack A. Kenyon Gilbert R. Meigs

Michael J. Killian William S. Merchant

Charles W. King Charles R. Merritt

Thomas R. Kinnebrew Ernest L. Mester, Jr.

Richard R. Kinnier John E. Meyers

Myrl S. Kirk Robert B. Midgette

David S. Kirbach John H. Mighell

William L. Kitchens Junius W. Millard

Patrick E. Klein Charles E. Miller

Kenneth D. Kleinholz Neal D. Miller

Eugene L. Klenk Richard J. Miller

Robert L. Knauss Richard F. Mills

Walter Kohler, Jr. Norman G. Mireault

Lawrence J. Korb Gilbert J. J. Mohr

Robert F. Korbitz Edwin C. Moncure, Jr.

Edward F. Kovanic Allan F. Montague

Robert S. Krayner Charles D. Moore

Allyn O. Kreps Huron C. Moore, Jr.

Dalton L. Kuder Thomas P. Moran

Gerald Kunz Kenneth B. Morley

Kenneth F. Kuzenski Robert R. Morley

Peter R. La Falce David W. Moriarty, Jr.

David R. Lambert William N. Morgan

Richard A. Lander Daniel N. Morrison

Lewis P. Lane II Julian K. Morrison III

William C. Landis Royden U. Morrison

Lawrence W. Langley David S. Morse

Thomas J. Langley Allen D. Moses

David L. Larson Robert E. Mosher

Richard P. Laskey Robert J. Moylan

Jack K. Lasseter Warren A. Mullen

Norman J. Laux Raymond T. Munsell

John H. Lawless Robert A. Murray

Richard P. Leach Clarence R. Muth

Lucian L. Leape, Jr. Clayman C. Myers, Jr.

Julian Lecraw Stig J. Mylander

James A. Ledbetter George A. Nankervis

John P. Leemhuis Frederick J. Lees

Douglas R. Legg Douglas R. Legg

Joel C. Leuchter Ted Levy

William G. Lillis William G. Lillis

Malcolm S. Lindstrom Arthur A. Lipski

John A. Loftus John A. Loftus

James B. Longley, Jr. Peter P. Lord

Robert F. Lorenz Robert F. Lorenz

John E. Lott John E. Lott

William J. Loughlin William J. Loughlin

Robert M. Lovell, Jr. Robert M. Lovell, Jr.

William R. Lucas William R. Lucas

Alexander S. Lyman Alexander S. Lyman

Robert D. Lyons Robert D. Lyons

James P. McCabe James P. McCabe

Ralph L. McClannan Ralph L. McClannan

Russell N. McDowell Russell N. McDowell

James R. McElhattan James R. McElhattan

II Robert S. McGeough

William D. McGinn William D. McGinn

Thomas D. McGregor Thomas D. McGregor

Phil C. McKee Phil C. McKee

Richard A. McLaughlin Richard A. McLaughlin

Gene C. Nelson
James N. Nelson
Richard E. Nelson, Jr.
Donald P. Nelson
Donald E. Neumann
Jack E. Newhard
James A. Newpher, Jr.
James W. Newsome
Robert B. Newton
Bruce Nichol
Thomas F. Niedbala
William R. Niesen
William L. Noel
James T. Nunnally III
Herbert J. O'Brien
James J. O'Brien
Canton O'Donnell, Jr.
Roger E. Oesterreich
Patrick J. O'Haren
Jeremiah D. O'Leary, Jr.
John D. Orr
John B. Orzalli
Franklin T. Osgood, Jr.
George H. Paff
David B. Palo
Sophocles G. Pappas
Joseph R. Parch
David K. Parkhill
Merle E. Farmer
Thomas K. Parrish III
George J. Pasek
Edward L. Paul
George Pavloff
Richard A. Pecaut
Paul C. Pelton, Jr.
Arnold O. Petersen, Jr.
Ingo H. Petersen
Norman G. Peterson
Ray E. Pierce
William R. Pierson
John C. Phifer
Herbert L. Pick, Jr.
Noel B. Pittman, Jr.
Paul H. Pittman
Edwin L. Podsiadlo
Charles R. Polen
Alvin J. Porter
Asa S. Porter
Henry M. Poss
George Postich
Jim C. Potter
George W. Powell
Richard W. Pratt
Ronald Prezioso
David J. Price
Robert T. Price
William J. Price
John E. Pyron, Jr.
Jay E. Quick
Richard P. Ralph
Thomas F. Randolph
Paul E. Ransdell
Louis J. J. Rauchenberger
Glen P. Ray
Robert S. Reaume
James H. Redic
Ralph J. Reeder
William B. Reif
James F. Reynolds
Stuart W. Rhodes
Paul E. Richter
Peter W. Robinson
Charles M. Rockwell, Jr.
Richard B. Rockwell
John F. Roesser, Jr.
Richard H. Rogers
Stephen H. Rogers
William P. Rogers
Louis P. Romestant, Jr.
Francis G. Ronnenberg
Gerald D. Rood
Robert Z. Rose
Billy D. Ross
John H. Ross
Robert P. Ross

Irwin Roth
Phillip L. Rother
James A. Runser
Robert D. Rupp
Robert O. Rutherford
Arless K. Saffell
John F. Salisbury
Seymour Salmirs
David S. Salsburg
William H. Sample
John H. Sandberg
Joseph G. Sanders
Stephen J. Sanford
Ralph F. Schauer
Martin Schiff, Jr.
Wayne A. Schild
Harold O. Schmokel
John J. Schofield
Hans P. Schonenberg
Leo R. Schreiber
William J. Schuch
Raymond E. Schucker
Edward P. Schwarz, Jr.
Michael Scott
William Scott, Jr.
William C. Scott
Philip D. Segal
David M. Selgren
Lawrence Shafer
Eugene R. Shannon, Jr.
Frank M. Shaver
Charles J. Sheehan
Robert N. Sheriden
Mack W. Shettles
Francis R. Short
John H. Siegmund
William R. Siems
James T. Simms
Philip C. Simon
David P. Simpson
John R. Slaughter
Addison R. Smith
Clifford R. Smith
Ernest L. Smith III
Gerald M. Smith
John F. Smith
Lawrence L. Smith
Noel I. Smith
Walter K. Smith
Donald M. Snell
Allan E. Snyder
Herbert J. V. Snyder
Howard A. Snyder
Billie M. Solleau
Louis T. Sovey
Jack L. Sparks
Paul F. Sprehe
Robert R. Stadelhofer
Augustus L. Stanford, Jr.
Dale E. Stauffer
Francis J. Steckbeck
John H. Stelt
William T. Stewart
William L. Stiff
Richard L. Stock
Walter E. Stone
James F. Stottlar
Leon C. Stromire
Edward F. Sullivan
Roger K. Summit
David K. Sunderland
William J. Sweet
Thomas B. Talley, Jr.
Edward R. Tasko
Dan O. Taylor
Richard L. Teaford
Robert W. Teeter
Jack C. Tholl
Alfred R. Thomas III
Richard H. Thomas III
James J. Thompson
John L. Thompson
Ernest A. Till
Thomas N. Timlin
James R. Titcomb
Ralph E. Tomkiewicz
Arthur E. Treiber
Paul H. Troutman

Dan S. Tucker
Thomas McK. Tucker
Harvey S. Turner
Willard L. VanErt
John C. Vaught
Jose W. Vega
William R. Vickroy
Edward L. Vogel
John W. Vold
Ralph L. Wagner
Thomas P. Walsh
William J. Walther
Conley R. Ward
Joseph T. Warkoczewski
David T. Warner
Richard D. Warren
Victor M. Warren
Arthur L. Wasserman, Jr.
Charles E. Watkins, Jr.
Richard M. Watt
Carl B. Weaver
John B. Weber
Robert M. Welham
Eugene R. Wells, Jr.
Joel F. Wells
Howard B. Wentz, Jr.
Robin A. Westbrook
John T. White
Bill E. Whitney
Clyde T. Whitley
John A. Widder, Jr.
Edward W. Foy (Naval R. O. T. C.) to be ensign in the Navy, in lieu of ensign in the Navy as previously nominated, to correct name.
The following-named (Naval R. O. T. C.) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy:
Randall K. Barron
Mebus Bartling
Robert E. Bartz
William T. Beagle
Frederick R. Beiler, Jr.
Thomas F. Bloom
Eugene F. Brigham
James N. Browne III
Richard L. Clancy
James C. Cohig
Morton D. Davis
John E. Flood, Jr.
James P. Gillett
Edward A. Goerner
Edward J. Gray
Oliver W. Hamilton, Jr.
Donald Stiggers (Naval R. O. T. C.) to be named a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps.
The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:
James S. Little
Willis P. Ude

IN THE NAVY
The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade and corps indicated:
CAPTAIN, LINE
George M. Holley
Robert J. Esslinger
William M. Drane
Albert S. Miller
Joseph E. Dodson
James D. L. Grant
Frank B. Miller
Warren H. McClain
John B. Gragg
Edgar J. MacGregor 3d
Paul P. Blackburn, Jr.
Parke H. Brady
Edward C. Renfro
Charles W. Lord
Henry P. Wright, Jr.
Ray F. Yager
Thomas M. Brown
James W. Haviland 3d
Robert R. Moore

Ralph R. Widner
Bruce Wilcox
Richard D. Wilder
Robert E. Wildridge
Robert L. Wiley, Jr.
Robert B. Wilkerson III
Dale E. Willhite
Henry W. Williams, Jr.
Donald K. Wilson
Francis M. Wilson
Harold K. Wilson
James W. Wilson
Randolph G. Wilson, Jr.
Richard H. Wilson
Robley Winfrey
Munroe J. Wingate
John W. Winter
Adrian B. Winterfield
Christopher Withers
Joseph E. Wolak
William M. Wolff, Jr.
Richard J. Wollensak
Roy S. Wood
Philip H. Wright
William R. Yetman
Donald K. Young
"J" R. Young, Jr.
John W. Young
Sylvan A. Yulsman
Harold E. Zell
David C. Zimmerman
Edward R. O. T. C.) to be ensign in the Navy, in lieu of ensign in the Navy as previously nominated, to correct name.
Harold H. Heinrich
George K. Helder
James O. Horgan
Don L. Hulsing
Robert A. Kirchgessner
Kay E. Lewis
Thornton McK. Long
Norman D. Luallin
Robert A. McKenzie
James H. Martin
Joseph W. Murphy
Maurice J. Murphy
John D. Nieder
Robert L. Strickland
Winthrop A. Wyman
Wesley E. Young
Donald Stiggers (Naval R. O. T. C.) to be named a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps.
The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:
James S. Little
Willis P. Ude

John F. Tatom
Robert R. Craighill
Louis D. McGregor, Jr.
Rowland C. Lawver
Ray E. Malpass
George G. Palmer
Joseph B. H. Young
Edmund S. L. Marshall
Charles E. McCombs
Roy A. Newton
Theodore T. Miller
Royal L. Rutter
Harold M. Heming
Horatio A. Lincoln
George O. Gjoerloff
Richard J. H. Conn
Lafayette J. Jones
George L. Heap
James G. Lang
George M. Chambers
Mervin Halstead
George F. Kosco
Harry P. Badger
Samuel P. Weller, Jr.
Herschel A. House
George T. McCready, Jr.
John Hulme
Rudolph C. Bauer
Frederick W. Laing
William N. Wylie
Carlton R. Adams
Raymond N. Sharp
Emmet O'Beirne
Edward Brumby
Scarritt Adams
Vernon L. Lowrance
David A. Harris
Charles R. Herms
William O. Snead, Jr.
Leo G. May
Edward E. Colestock
Lawrence E. Ruff
Ira E. McMillan
William Y. Allen, Jr.
Walter W. Strohbehn
Elonzo B. Grantham, Jr.
James D. Whitfield, Jr.
Charles H. Andrews
Montgomery L. McCullough, Jr.
Frederic C. Lucas, Jr.
Keith M. Krieger
Charles T. Mauro, Jr.
Alexander Jackson, Jr.
David D. Hawkins
Dana B. Cushing
Walter T. Jenkins
Elvin Hahn
John B. Bowen, Jr.
Herbert H. Marable
Ellis K. Wakefield
Thaddeus J. Van Metre
Douglas B. Broken-shire
William E. Ellis
Allan B. Roby
Alston M. Boyd, Jr.
William S. Post, Jr.
William T. Doyle, Jr.
Harry J. Verhoye
Everett M. Block
Lyle L. Koepke
Henry G. Sanchez
Bowen F. McLeod
Josephus A. Robbins
John B. Azer
Oliver D. T. Lynch
Edson H. Whitehurst
William H. Sanders, Jr.
Charles L. Westhofen
John B. Dimmick
Arthur E. Owen
Francis M. Carter
Harry Smith
John G. Howell
Elias B. Mott 2d

William L. Harmon
James H. Newsome
Norwood A. Campbell
Thomas S. Webb
John F. Flynn
Joseph A. Ruddy, Jr.
John M. Bristol
William W. Willbourne
Burton S. Hanson, Jr.
Doyle M. Coffee
Ian C. Eddy
Elmer J. Dunn
Kelvin L. Nutting
Davis W. Olney
Edwin O. Wagner
Macpherson B. Williams
Joseph C. Clifton
Roscoe L. Newman
John E. Edwards
Charles C. Howerton
Thomas K. Wright
James O. Vosseller
Ray R. Conner
James A. Adams
Clyde B. Stevens, Jr.
Harvey P. Burden
Chesley M. Hardison
Edmund E. Garcia
Hal K. Edwards
Hayes E. Irons
Joseph B. Maher
Alexander C. Veasey
Horacio Rivero, Jr.
Allan L. Reed
John B. Colwell
Robert L. Taylor
James T. Lay
Robert E. Gadow
Harold Payson, Jr.
Bernard F. Roeder
Edward M. Day
Thomas R. Kurtz, Jr.
Charles G. Duffy
Peter R. Lackner
Francis J. Johnson
William H. Farmer
Walter C. Wingard, Jr.
Albert F. White
Emmanuel T. Goyette
Myron W. Graybill
Erle V. Dennett
Francis W. McCann
Albert D. Lucas
Emery Roughton
George R. Over
Paul F. Heerbrandt
Thomas D. Tyra
Richard K. Anderson
Thomas W. Rogers
Ernest C. Holtzworth
Albert K. Romberg
John O. F. Dorsett
Joseph E. Flynn
Max L. Catterton
Sherman W. Betts
George A. Hutton
Gordon A. Uehling
Charles T. Booth 2d
Ray C. Needham
Edward A. Wright
John A. Webster
Edward H. Guilbert
Joseph F. Foley
Francis B. Merkle
Francis A. McKee
Berton A. Robbins, Jr.
Edwin B. Hooper
William W. Hollister
William B. Braun
Hazlett P. Weatherwax
John L. Chaw

Sanford L. Mead
Eugene Tatom
Ashton B. Jones, Jr.
Robert E. Lockwood
Walter P. Schoeni
Maxim W. Firth
George K. Williams

CAPTAIN, MEDICAL CORPS

Bennett F. Avery
Lawrence L. Bean

CAPTAIN, SUPPLY CORPS

Carlos M. Charneco
Hugh C. Haynsworth, Jr.
George W. Foott
Thomas L. Becknell, Jr.
James W. Boundy

CAPTAIN, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Henry G. Clark
James C. Tily
Pinckney M. Jeffords
Arthur I. Flaherty

CAPTAIN, DENTAL CORPS

Lauro J. Turbini
Robert E. Blair

COMMANDER, LINE

Thomas D. Keegan
William R. Laird, Jr.
Howard A. Thompson
Richard W. Phillips
George V. Rogers
Raphael A. Zoeller
George S. Simmons 3d
Clayton Ross, Jr.
Alfred J. Toulon, Jr.
Harold C. Miller
Charles N. G. Hendrix
John P. Seifert
James L. May
James H. Elsom
William W. Gentry
Irving D. Dewey
Clay H. Raney
George J. Largess
Marcus L. Lowe, Jr.
Richard J. Dressling
James M. Hill
Robert A. Gulick, Jr.
Walter K. Stow, Jr.
Charles D. McCall
Loren H. Kiser
Marlin D. Clausner
Ronald F. Stultz
Frank J. Coulter
James B. Wallace
Francis M. Welch
Sigmund A. Bobczynski
James A. McAllister
Ivan D. Quillin
Warren J. Davis, Jr.
Carl J. Ballinger, Jr.
John R. Blackburn
John C. Mathews
Harvey R. Nylund
Andrew R. Drea
Valentine G. Holzapfel
Frederick M. Radel
Robert Brent
Arthur F. Fischer, Jr.
Emmett M. Compton
Lincoln Marcy
Partee W. Crouch, Jr.
Stephen C. O'Rourke
Edward F. Rye
John R. Zullinger
Means Johnston, Jr.
Davis Cone
Albert G. Neal
Landon L. Davis, Jr.
James D. Ramage
Jack W. Hough
Ellis J. Fisher
Gene T. Shirley
William J. Carey, Jr.
George D. Ghesquiere
David G. Bryce

Robert M. Reynolds
James O. Biglow
Ronald K. Smith
John T. Wulf
Donald J. MacDonald
Robert B. Heilig

Bishop L. Malpass
Charles M. Parker

Willard C. Johnson
Onnie P. Lattu
Clark T. Abbott
Lionel C. Peppell
Jesse S. McAfee
Joseph F. Tenney

William A. Zobel
George K. Brodie
Ralph N. Ernest

George D. Odiorne
Robert W. Wheelock

Charles W. Cushman
John P. Weinel
George W. Forbes, Jr.
Robert M. Brownlie
Harvey L. Lasell
John B. Williams, Jr.
William D. Bonvillian
Robert C. Gillette
William T. Alford
George T. McDaniel, Jr.
Ira S. Hardman, Jr.
Edward L. Dashiell, Jr.
John B. Howland
John C. Weatherwax
Robert G. Merritt
Robert J. Duryea
Robert H. Smith
John M. Cease
Russell H. Buckley
Max A. Berns, Jr.
George C. Simmons, Jr.
Rex W. Warner
Robert R. Startzell
John T. T. O'Neill
Harold A. Wells
Stephen L. Johnson
Eugene B. Henry, Jr.
Wayne D. Baker
Russell J. Schmidt
Leonard Kenny
Richard H. Lachman
Charles A. Baldwin
John B. Kaye
Marion R. Clark
Edwin O. Standish
Walter J. Rountree
Robert B. Satterford
Luther R. Johnson
Andreas R. Czerwonky
Glen Jacobsen
Marion C. Walley
Jonathan F. Rice
Ralph F. Locke
Gerald S. Norton
Ralph S. Stevens, Jr.
Stanley W. Vejtasa
Brainard T. Macomber
Charles A. Iarrobino
Jacob J. Maechtlen, Jr.
Edward N. Little
Charles C. Smith
Louis S. Gard
Dick M. Wheat
Howard H. Brandenburg
Herbert B. Howard
James C. Hargreaves

Raymond V. Van Wolkenten
Henry E. Staley
Morris G. Duchin
Robert H. Keehn
Felix Caracciolo
Herbert E. Ost
John S. Eversole
Theodore J. Banvard
William O. Powell, Jr.
Lincoln C. Koch
Nils R. Larson
John G. Sheridan
James G. Daniels
Richard S. Roberts
Edward T. Deacon
John H. R. Fehler
Frank L. Lawlor
Francis X. Driscoll
Richard W. Fleck
John R. Ducat
Norman V. Scurreia
Douglas G. Phillips
Charles A. Shipman
Robert W. Robbins
George S. Leonard
Walter G. Barnes, Jr.
Wilfred H. Genest
Samuel L. Prickett, Jr.
Edward L. McDonald
James A. Potter III
Martin P. MacNair
Glen E. Hoffman
John H. Graves, Jr.
Alexander B. Duesenbury
LeRoy W. J. Keith
David L. Soper
Herbert S. Brown, Jr.
Charles D. Huston
Guilbert W. Martin
William R. Leonard, Jr.
Robert E. Cummings
Robert H. Hare
Robert B. Buchan
Noel W. McDaniel
Francis J. Grisko
Earle C. Gordon, Jr.
Craig McKee
Elbert S. McCuskey
William S. Woolen
Joseph G. Smith
Alan H. Yates
Herbert E. Hanset
Frank Malinasky
Herbert T. Schmidt
William T. Sutherland
Albert D. Pollock, Jr.
William Godwin
Donald C. Coy
Jerry F. Daniels, Jr.
Richard J. Craig
Dexter C. Rumsey, 2d
Edward F. Harschutz
Charles C. Hoffman
Robert J. Sutherland
Gordon K. Ebbe
Spencer D. Wright
Paul J. Knapp
Henry G. McDonough
Erwin G. Schwab
John K. Sloatman, Jr.
Wilbur Y. Morton
Joseph T. Watson, Jr.
Marvin P. Morton, Jr.
Samuel R. Clarke
James A. Brough
Carlton F. Alm
Oliver P. Johnstone
Edward T. Hogan
Roland L. Hastreiter
Charles B. Kelly
William G. Neese
Richard C. Hunt
Robert W. Lund
John D. Moroney
John B. Wayne
David C. Carmichael
Willard D. King
Thomas B. Ellison

Harold M. Helsel
Carl W. Rinehart
Arthur L. Jacobson
Eugene C. Smith
Paul T. Weber
Harold A. Robinson
Gordon N. Owens
Leonard B. Smith
Maynard M. Furney
Edward W. Bergstrom
Jerry R. Siefert
Charlie N. Conatser
Whitney Wright
Joseph L. Hall
William T. Hardaker
Langford W. Bates
Richard B. Forward
Louis P. Pressler
Charles Timblin
Hilbert S. Coffield
Theodore W. Marshall
Walter E. Clarke
Winford A. Swenson
Walter J. Murphy
Guy Howard
Max D. Wivlett
John E. Odell, Jr.
Robert U. Nolen
Frank B. Gorman
Carlton H. Clark
Charles A. Gearhart
Joseph M. Kellam
Lester E. Geer
Rupert D. Hawley
Daniel W. Heagy
Ira F. Reese
John M. Stuart
Elof W. Hermanson
Harlow Hines
Clifford Evans, Jr.
Theodore R. Cooley
Hubert W. Fisher
Robert R. Snyder
John C. Keatts
Karl S. Van Meter
Robertson C. Dailey
Fred G. Archbold, Jr.
Dermott V. Hickey
Wilfred K. Bradbury
William H. Robinson
Grayston H. Weber
Gordon A. Sherwood
Leo R. Schwabe
William E. Hardy
Charles E. Rice, Jr.
Thomas E. Blade
David Bolton
Robert L. Sage
Sydney G. Rubinow, Jr.
Irving J. Schuyler
James T. Reed
Edward E. Sack
William G. Boyer
Charles A. Walruff
Philip C. Morris
Harold W. McKinney
James F. Wilbur, Jr.
Jay B. Yakeley, Jr.
Paul W. McEntire
Wilfred E. Fleshman
Ronald W. Hoel
Fred H. Rand
Andrew M. Egeland
Forrest A. Lees
Melvin C. Hoffman
John C. Roberts, Jr.
Ira L. Jones
Ray P. Minniear
Norris L. McComb
William E. Scarborough
Laurence B. Williamson
Leslie D. Davis
Robert W. Weber
Clarence A. Blouin
Thomas W. Hunt
Frank O. Green
William B. Paulin
John S. Kilner, Jr.

Robert M. J. Halman
Francis G. Gooding, Jr.
Albert M. Ellingson
Henry C. Colee, Jr.
Richard D. Gruber
Willard E. Eder
William P. Tanner, Jr.
Vernon J. Coley, Jr.
Robert L. Donley
Robert Wagner
Norman E. Knapp
Hugh B. Sanders, Jr.
James L. Henderson
Garth D. Gilmore
Wesley H. Ruth
William F. Payson
George O. Wood
Russell G. Albright
Mitchell K. Disney
Edgar F. Hazleton, Jr.
Max E. E. Woyke
Raymond A. Robinson
Nelson E. Harris
Clarence L. Foushee
Gaylord S. Parrett
George L. Gullette
Max V. Ricketts
James H. Davies
Robert W. Gabel
Donald W. Bowman
Grover G. Gilmore
Ralph V. Wilhelm
August A. Barthes
Robert C. Corlett
Marion F. Barfield
Elbert V. Cain, Jr.
John W. Roberts
Houlder Hudgins
Delwin A. Liane
Frank L. DeLorenzo
John M. Arbuckle
Frank J. Hill
Jack L. Grayson
Henry B. Somerville
Hugh D. O'Neill
Ambrose J. Kinion, Jr.
David B. Rodman
Norman K. Brady
Harry A. Clark
Lyle B. Ramsey
Frank J. Graziano
Jack J. Hinman 3d
Edward Muhlenfeld
Royal K. Joslin
Raymond J. Schneider
Ralph I. Gerber
Harvey B. Seim
John I. Hardy
Alexander S.
Goodfellow, Jr.
John D. Chase
James C. Cochran
Clifford W. Bundy
Roman L. Brooks
Ira K. Blough, Jr.
William D. Baker
William H. House
John F. Refo
Thomas C. Gurley
Lyle H. Keator
Herman J. Trum 3d
Arthur J. Ela
William D.
Roseborough, Jr.
Norbert Frankenberger
Raymond J. Koshliek
Cary H. Hall
Leonard F. Bassett
William R. Boehm
John J. McMullen
Stanley E. Ellison
Samuel A. Forter
Albert H. Clancy, Jr.
Charles W. Smalzel
Anthony C. Benjes, Jr.
Harvey O. Vogel
John B. Mutty
Scott Lothrop

George H. Kronmiller
James J. Coyle
Horace E. Bent
James F. Phelan
Myron Alpert
Ernest W. Dobie, Jr.
Earl W. McLaughlin
Conrad H. Carlson
Jack A. Holmes
Charles H. Champion
Daniel S. Appleton
Lynn S. Orser
Henry J. Ereckson, Jr.
Edward J. Fruechtl
Manley C. Osborne
Miles A. Libbey
Edward R.
Fickenscher, Jr.
Robert E. Harris
James C. Smith, Jr.
William C. Bryan
Frederick H.
Michaelis
William C. Vickrey, Jr.
Oscar E. Gray, Jr.
Robert R. Boettcher
Vernon E. Teig
Richard J. Nesbitt
Neil H. Fisher
John E. Greenbacker
John P. Howatt
Robert E. Clements
Christian H. Cochran
Richard L. Cochran
Ward W. Witter
Roy G. Anderson
Raymond E. Hill
William E. Fly
William A. Clark
William M. Carpenter
William E. Lamb
Benjamin T. Frana
Lawrence S. Lockett
Harold T. Goranson
Edward C. Sledge
Sidney A. Sherwin, Jr.
Blaine E. Eader
Terry T. McGillicuddy
William E. Benbow
Michael J. Hanley, Jr.
Alonzo H. Wellman, Jr.
Everett E. Roberts, Jr.
William H. Game
Edward F. Hayes
John M. Miller
William R. McKinney
Robert K. Kaufman
John T. Straker
Herman H. Klare, Jr.
William R. Meyer
Raymond A. Hundevadt
John W. Williams
Alfred C. Edwards
Edward A. Rodgers
Louis P. Gray 3d
Rex E. Rader
Frank M. Hertel
John H. Howell
Irvin G. Peters
James B. Cannon
John W. M. Montgomery
William W. Bush, Jr.
Lester B. Libbey, Jr.
Bruce K. Lloyd, Jr.
Felix L. Englander
Orval C. Dickes
Donald E. Bruce
John W. Henry
Charles J. Beers
Mat M. Cain, Jr.
Bud K. Beaver
Henry D. Davison
James C. Longino, Jr.
William M. Hodges
Robert S. Dall
Wallace A. Utley
Robert A. Weatherup
Philip T. Glennon

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 31, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who art the source and strength of our life and the supreme Lord of our minds and hearts, may we daily surrender ourselves unreservedly to Thy divine will, which is infinitely wiser than our own.

Inspire us with a new appreciation and deeper reverence for the sacred moral and spiritual values as the foundation stones upon which to build a nobler personal character, a stronger nation, and a finer civilization.

Show us how we may stem the tides of paganism and secularism and be obedient and loyal to those lofty instincts and capacities with which we have been created and endowed.

May the voice of America not be primarily one that proclaims what our Nation possesses and produces in material goods but may it be a voice that proclaims plainly and proudly those ideals and principles which have been and are the secret of our country's greatness and glory.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 28, 1952, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on March 29, 1952, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1012. An act to permit educational, religious, or charitable institutions to import textile machines and parts thereof for instructional purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Langers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2786. An act to amend section 106 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 52-15.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. McGRATH, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 7313) making appropriations for

the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1672), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. HORAN reserved all points of order on the bill.

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an address delivered by President Truman last Saturday night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me, I include the following address of the President of the United States at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner in the National Guard Armory, Washington, D. C., on March 29, 1952:

Thank you very much. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice President, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chairman of the Democratic Committee, distinguished guests, and fellow Democrats, I am very happy to be here tonight.

This makes seven Jefferson-Jackson dinners that I have spoken to in the city of Washington. I hope to attend several more in one capacity or another.

They have all been wonderful dinners. One of the things I like about the dinners is the fact that they are political meetings. I like political meetings and I like politics.

Politics—good politics—is public service. There is no life or occupation in which a man can find a greater opportunity to serve his community or his country.

I have been in politics more than 30 years, and I know that nothing else could have given me greater satisfaction. I have had a career from precinct to President, and I am a little bit proud of that career.

I am sure all of you here tonight are very much interested in the presidential election this year.

In view of that fact I thought I would give you a little analysis of the political situation as I see it.

The political situation in this country may look complicated, but you can find the key to it in a simple thing—the Republicans have been out of office for 20 long years, and they are desperate to get back in office so they can control the country again.

For 20 years the Republicans have been wandering in a political desert—like camels looking for an oasis. They don't drink the same thing that camels do, though. And if they don't find it pretty soon, the Republican Party may die out altogether.

You know, I would just hate to see that happen. I would like to help keep the Republican Party alive if that is at all possible. So I am going to offer them a little advice about the error of their ways.

There are some very good reasons why the Republicans have been out of office so long and haven't been able to get back in control.

The first reason is that they were voted out in 1932 because they had brought the country to the brink of ruin.

In the 1920's the Republican administrations drew back in petrified isolation from our world responsibilities. They spent all their time trying to help the rich get richer and paid no attention to the welfare of the workers and the farmers. All in all, they paved the way for the biggest economic smash-up this country has ever seen.

COMMANDER, MEDICAL CORPS

James D. King	William A. Robie
Harry L. Day	William C. Cantrell
Robert H. Bradshaw	James A. Addison
Joseph R. Connelly	Ralph D. Ross
William G. Lawson	John A. O'Donoghue
James H. Boyers	James A. Brimson
Clyde W. Norman	Karl R. Whitney
Charles S. Mullin, Jr.	John F. Chace
Jack C. McCurdy	Leo S. Madlem, Jr.
James A. Turner	Haskell M. Wertheimer
William A. Dinsmore, Jr.	James D. Hague
	Joseph J. Connor
William A. Wulfsman	Vincent A. Balkus

COMMANDER, SUPPLY CORPS

Kenneth R. Wheeler	James E. Tinling
Harold H. Hunt	Roy O. Yockey
James G. Walsh	William C. Humphrey
Eben M. Standish	George S. Lofink
William G. Tonner, Jr.	Forrest P. Brown
William A. Cochran	Chester W. Utterback
Robert L. Watson	Donald J. W. Hos
Edward T. Dobbyn, Jr.	Raymond E. Johnson
Ralph W. Clark, Jr.	William L. Thorpe, Jr.
Conrad T. Budny	Joseph R. Roszel
Richard Cobb	Chester C. Snyder
Homan L. Walsh	Robert J. Wuest
Preston R. Clark	Austin H. Barnett, Jr.
George H. Henry	Ivan C. Hartzell
Alfred C. Jackson	William J. Leonard
Paul F. Cosgrove, Jr.	Carl A. Raymond, Jr.
Paul R. Lally	Selden S. Hoos
John D. Carson	Perry C. Conner
Ellis G. Youtz	James S. Spore
James W. Haggard	Robert C. Disher
Donald T. Rohde	John K. Aldrich
Louis J. Barta	Ralph W. Sauer
George A. Kelley, Jr.	Ross A. Porter
Glen C. Moore	

COMMANDER, CHAPLAIN CORPS

John M. Kleckner	Marion O. Stephenson
Otto D. F. Herrmann	James W. Kelly
Robert W. Coe, Jr.	James A. Whitman
Charles D. Beatty	Charles J. Covert
Joseph C. Canty	Henry J. Rodrige
David A. Sharp, Jr.	Edward A. Slattery
Raymond F. McManus	

COMMANDER, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Millard H. Aubey	Irwin M. Smith
William J. Byrnes	William R. Yankey
Chester J. Kurzawa	Louis N. Saunders, Jr.
Thomas J. Doyle	Robert R. Wooding

COMMANDER, DENTAL CORPS

Willard R. McClellan	Kenneth L. Morgan
Harold N. Siemer	Silas D. Cunningham
Joseph M. Clements	Clayton L. Bohn
Walter F. Hanley	Paul A. Moore
Louis J. Rhen	Albert L. Vogel, Jr.
Robert B. Young	Von Rue McAtee
Duane R. Shiffert	Walter H. Peat
George T. Moore, Jr.	Frank S. Wozniak, Jr.
Frank D. Dobyns	William E. Crolius
John E. Wiseman	Harold J. Ralston
George E. Madden	Ferris G. Hodge
John H. Cathcart	Dan B. White
Gordon L. Miller	

COMMANDER, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Max E. Zimmerman	Fay O. Huntsinger
Daniel J. O'Brien	Chester S. Fay
Clarence J. Owen	

COMMANDER, NURSE CORPS

Margaret C. Jensen	Kathleen F. Smith
Gladys Smith	Erna A. Richards

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, MEDICAL CORPS

James R. McShane

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, DENTAL CORPS

Eugene C. Walter

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate March 31 (legislative day of March 24), 1952:

POSTMASTER

SOUTH DAKOTA

Bernard A. O'Reilly, Stephan.